

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

---

NO. LXXI.—JANUARY, 1853.

---

## ART. I.—ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY, IN ITS RELATION TO CHRIST.

BY NOVANGLUS.

*The History of Ancient Philosophy.* By Dr. HEINRICH RITTER. Translated by Morrison. 4 vols. Oxford. 1846.

*A Brief View of Greek Philosophy.* Nos. VI., VII. of Small Books on Great Subjects. 2d edition. Pickering: London. 1850.

*Cours de la Histoire de la Philosophie.* Par VICTOR COUSIN. Didier: Paris. 1847.

*A Biographical History of Philosophy.* By G. H. LEWES. 4 vols. Charles Knight: London. 1845.

THE human mind is under the necessity of bringing all things into unity. It is itself a unit; nature therefore must appear to it as a unit, or universe. Again, each man as well as each society, and of course the entire race, stands, so to speak, between two infinities, or two eternities, though these are only one, in which we are embosomed, like islands in a boundless sea. And as nothing can happen without the supposition of an adequate cause, mankind must ascribe their origin to the one Supreme Power, whether named Mind, Reason, Spirit, Creator or God.

Thus man, the moment he begins to reflect profoundly, finds himself pressed on all sides by the idea of the Infinite and Eternal. Thought presupposes and necessitates this idea. It begins with this, ends with this; for it ever starts from a limit, as it comes to a limit, beyond which it must ac-

knowledge the presence of absolute and eternal being; precisely as a part begins with a whole, ends with a whole. The segment of a circle, nay its slightest line or radius, presupposes the existence of that circle; time presupposes eternity; the mind of man presupposes the mind of God. For if there be a finite, there must also be an infinite mind. The temporary thought of man necessitates the eternal thought of God. This is the mysterious circle, within which, whether he sees it or not, all the reasonings of man revolve.

There are those indeed, who, in their investigations, keep assiduously within the fragmentary and mechanical; notwithstanding their inquiries are always coming to a limit, beyond which may be descried that infinite ocean into which they so much fear to plunge. As finite minds they lean upon God and eternity, as all their science, else limited and perishable, leans upon God and eternity, even at the moment that they hesitate to acknowledge the stupendous fact. Their philosophy, however, is shallow and transient; and though useful perhaps to material interests, leaves them without any real beauty or grandeur of thought.

But the great majority of thinkers will constantly transcend such narrow bounds, and press the inquiry, *Whence are we, and whither do we go?*

This is the real origin of speculative philosophy, especially in its higher range, a philosophy ever soliciting attention, ever attracting thinkers. The ocean of thought, indeed, is boundless, and many swift ships go down into its mysterious depths; nevertheless all human souls, freighted with any great ideas, must sail thereupon. Shore or no shore they must adventure their all upon its heaving billows. Hence one of the most interesting elements of ancient civilization, especially in the more enlightened communities, is speculative philosophy. Its relation to Christ deserves our candid consideration, especially in the pages of such a Review as ours.

The early fathers of the church, Clemens Romanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr, the author of the Epistle of Diognetus, (sometimes ascribed to Justin Martyr, but assigned by Semisch and Neander to another,) Tertullian, Origen and others, while acknowledging its obvious defects, allow that it embodied portions of the truth, and formed a preparation for Christ. The apostle Paul himself, refers to the manifestation of God in the mind of the heathen, as rendering them without excuse in departing from the truth. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them: for the invisible



things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead; so that they are without excuse.\* He affirms, indeed, in another place, that "the world by wisdom knew not God," that is adequately and satisfactorily; for after all, philosophy, especially in its later developments, was a failure. It gave no rest to the weary conscience of man, and left the way of life in the greatest obscurity. Still it nourished a few great characters, and produced a dim and often passionate longing for a higher light. Some pious and learned men have even gone so far as to regard Socrates, Plato, Plutarch, and some others, as a sort of Christians by anticipation. So charmed was Erasmus with the character of Socrates, that we find him on one occasion exclaiming, *Sancte Socrates ora pro nobis!* Holy Socrates pray for us!

This, doubtless, is carrying the matter a little too far; nevertheless, it must be allowed that many of the Grecian sages, considering their circumstances, made some remarkable approximation to the great central truth of the divine unity and supremacy, and the possibility on the part of man, of union and fellowship with God. In his *Stromata*, Clement of Alexandria, uses the following remarkable language: "Indeed, before the coming of the Lord, philosophy was needful to the Greeks, for the reformation of their lives, and even now it is an aid to piety, supplying as it does some rudimentary teaching for those who subsequently may receive the faith upon conviction. For God is indeed the cause of all good things, of some preëminently and directly, as of the Old and New Testaments: of others, indirectly, by means of reason and argument; as philosophy which he probably gave to the Greeks before the Lord himself came, in order to call them also to his service. For philosophy acted the part of a school-master to the Greeks, as the law of Moses did to the Jews, for the purpose of bringing men to Christ, and thus preparing the way for such as were to be advanced by him to perfection."†

It is well known that the philosophical systems of the ancient world, often meager as well as variant and contradictory, generally revolved around the idea of *the Infinite*, and in their higher forms recognized the existence of a Supreme Intelligence, and the immortality of the soul.‡ It must not,

\* Rom., chap. i., v. 19, 20.

† *Stromata*, lib. i., c. v.

‡ The doctrine of the immortality of the soul, however, in their view, was associated with that of the *metempsychosis*. See Ritter's *History of Ancient Philosophy*, i., p. 156.

however, be supposed that speculative inquiry, in any age, grasped fully these great truths, or held them for any length of time with persistent consistency. The author of "Small Books on Great Subjects," in his "Brief View of Greek Philosophy," has been betrayed into considerable error upon this subject, by depending too exclusively upon the testimony of Brücker, who though learned and faithful, is by no means discriminating, and by transferring his own views and modes of thought to those ancient sages. Ritter, to whom he never refers, is a far superior authority. Any one who will take the trouble of comparing this writer's account of the early Greek philosophy with that of the author of the View in the "Small Books," will easily be satisfied upon this point. For example, the author of the Brief View makes the half mythic Thales, of whom we know so little, a sublime and consistent Theist, chiefly on the authority of Cicero, who, as Ritter has shown, has fallen into a mistake, in his statement upon this subject. He shows that Thales, while maintaining water as the origin of all things, ascribed to the world an energetic soul, or as he expressed it, that "the universe is ensouled, and full of demons," in corroboration of which Ritter quotes a passage from Aristotle, *De Animo*, and adds in a note, "These expressions may have misled Cicero, in the false view of the Thaletic doctrine which he gives *De Nat. Deorum*, i. 10; and which must be rejected entirely, since otherwise the ancients would have said Thales regarded not water alone, but water and God as his primary essences."\*

In quite a number of other instances it might be shown that the author of the Sketch, in the "Small Books," has failed to give the precise views of the Greek philosophers, not so much from a want of information, as from an anxiety to present them in the most favorable light. In fact he has unintentionally thrown a certain *couleur de rose* over the whole subject. But we have a different object on the present occasion, and must refer our readers to Ritter's great work, thus far the most complete and reliable account of the ancient Greek philosophy, and above all to the original sources, the works of Plato, Aristotle and others. Cousin's *Leçons*, upon this subject, in the early part of his "Cours de la Philosophie," are clear, and upon the whole reliable, so far as they go. The work of Lewes, in four small volumes, published by Knight, of London, in his "Weekly Library," entitled a Biographical History of Philosophy, though con-

---

\* Ritter's History of Philosophy, i. p. 200.

taining considerable information, in a pleasing form, is by no means reliable, either for accuracy of statement, or depth of judgment. Obviously an admirer of Comte's "*Philosophie Positive*," he ignores utterly the very idea of a spiritual or divine philosophy. Doubtless the vagaries and extravagances, both of ancient and modern speculatists, deserve the severest reprehension. It may be difficult also, perhaps impossible, to construct anything, in systematic form, which ought to be dignified with the name of absolute science; still it is possible, for us to know enough of God, of the soul, and of the soul-world, even from the lights of nature, including the reason and conscience of man, to form a basis for the duties and sanctions of religion. The Bible itself assumes the existence of God and the spirituality of the soul, as truths connatural to the human mind; and thence justifies a rational investigation of its highest revelations. It makes its appeal to the reason and conscience of the race, which, while they can not discover a perfect religion, are competent to acknowledge its beauty when discovered.

It is possible too, that in all ages, fragments of a primitive revelation have been floating about in the common mind. God has never, in this respect, left himself without a witness; and who shall say, that some special divine influence may not have been exerted upon the minds of certain thoughtful and virtuous men among the heathen? Still, ancient philosophy never assumed anything like a perfect or permanent form, and certainly never discovered the great truths of what is called "*natural religion*," except by occasional glimpses and irradiations.

It will be allowed that the views of none ever rose higher than those of Socrates and Plato. In them, ancient philosophy gained its culminating point. And yet Plato himself must have regarded his inquiries as only the beginnings of a speculative system. Every one familiar with his writings, must be struck with their variant and fragmentary character. His modes of reasoning are far from uniform; his opinions by no means coherent. A thousand questions are started without an attempt at solution. Many are left purposely obscure, as if for the sake of confounding inquiry.\* Portions of his works are clearly mythical, yet how far believed by himself, is an unsettled question. At times he despairs of any

---

\* This is strikingly exemplified in the *Theætetos*, where his attempts to define science seem to fail. It is true that with Plato science is the *real*, the *essential*, the *permanent*; but the question recurs, what is the *real*, the *essential*, the *permanent*?



but a few philosophical spirits arriving at the truth. He feels that none can reach the knowledge of the absolute and ineffable Essence, from whom are all things. Hence his mournful confession, "To discover then the Creator and Father of this Universe, as well as his work, is indeed difficult, and when discovered, it is impossible to reveal him to mankind at large."\*

Still, Plato did teach, in forms more or less perfect, the existence of an infinite God, and the immortality of the soul, insisting strongly and often beautifully on its high capacity for virtue and everlasting life. Socrates, as an interlocutor in the Platonic dialogues, declares his belief of this consolatory doctrine. In his last hours he referred to it, and died, apparently, in the hope of a better world. We say *apparently*, for he certainly does not express the profound assurance and joyful expectation which a Christian is permitted to cherish. On other occasions he defends the immortality of the soul, as a speculative tenet; but here he admits the possibility of a doubt. He seems like one "treading the common path into the great darkness," hoping to find a home, yet not knowing whether even "a thread" of consciousness will remain "to tell how still it is."

"We may hence conclude," he says, "that there is great hope that death is a blessing. For to die is one of two things; for either the dead may be annihilated, and have no sensation of anything whatever; or, as it is said, there is a certain change and passage of the soul from one place to another. And if it is a privation of all sensation, as it were a sleep, in which *the sleeper has no dream*, death would be a wonderful gain.† For I think that if any one, having selected a night in which he slept so soundly as not to have had a dream, and having compared this night with all the other nights and days of his life, should be required on reflection to say how many he had passed better or more pleasantly than this, I think that not only a private person, but the great king himself, would find them easy to number in comparison with other days and nights. If, therefore, death is such a thing, I say it is a gain; for thus all futurity appears only as a single night. But if on the other hand, death is a removal hence to some other place, and what is said be true, that all the dead are there, what greater blessing can there be than this, my judges? For if, on arriving at Hades, released from those who pretend to be judges, one shall find those that are true

---

\* *Timaëus*, c. viii., compare *Repub.*, vi., p. 506.

† The italics are ours.

judges, and who are said to judge there, Minos and Rhadamanthus, Æacus and Triptolemus, and such others of the demigods as were just during their own lives, would this be a sad removal? At what price would you not estimate a conference with Orpheus and Musæus, Hesiod and Homer? I indeed should be willing to die often, were this true. Most admirable would it be for me to sojourn there, where I should meet those ancient heroes who died by an unjust sentence. The comparing my sufferings with theirs would, I think, be no unpleasant occupation. But the greatest pleasure would be to spend my time in questioning the people there as I have done those here, and discovering who among them is wise, and who not, except in fancy. \* \* Surely for that the judges there do not condemn to death; for in other respects those who live there are happier than those that are here, and are thenceforth immortal, at least if what is said be true."

After remarking that all which happens to a good man is wisely ordered, and forgiving his judges for their injustice, thus giving evidence of a noble and serene temper, he closes with these memorable words: "But it is now time to depart, for me to die, for you to live. But which of us is going to a better state is known only to the gods."\*

But it may be said, that ancient philosophy never went further than this, nay could never afterward be sustained at an equal elevation. It rather deteriorated, now lapsing into scepticism on the one hand, or materialism on the other, or in despite of these into an unreasoning mysticism.

Among the orientals, especially of India, it never much transcended a sort of vague nature-worship, or the acknowledgment of the Infinite, as *the All*, from which the mystic thinkers of those dreamy regions believed they had come, and whither they expected to go. In one of their schools it assumed the form of atheistic materialism.† In another, it terminated in absolute idealism. It readily blended with polytheism, as an emanation from the fountain of life, and cherished the hope, not of an individual conscious immortality, but of complete absorption in the Deity or Universe.‡

Among the Greeks, speculative inquiry, with inconsiderable exceptions, as in the case of Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato, a few of the Academics and Stoics, was rarely practical in its results. The common people never received it.

---

\* Plato's Works. Apologia, 32, 33.

† See Cousin's Hist. de la Philos., 2d series, tome xi., 5th Leçon, *La Sensualisme Dans L' Inde*, p. 110.

‡ Ritter's Hist. of An. Ph., i., pp. 90, 93.

Plato himself regarded them as incapable of philosophy.\* Nor did it ever thoroughly free itself from polytheism. Occasionally it mingled with popular superstitions, and modified the character of the "Mysteries," especially among the higher classes of society, giving to religious rites a deeper significance, yet oftener divesting them of all their power. Its most common and popular effect among the patrician families was scepticism and indifference, frequently downright Epicureanism.

Its fundamental problems, too, were never thoroughly solved. Even in modern times, few indeed among the profoundest metaphysical thinkers, consider them solved. A coherent system of spiritual philosophy, or of absolute science, does not exist. By many indeed, all Ontology, as a positive science, is regarded as impossible.† Perhaps all such inquiries, at least in their higher relations, transcend the unaided powers of the human mind. The relation of matter to thought, or of thought to matter, the origin and duration of matter, the origin and duration of mind, the relation of the finite to the infinite, the possible production of the finite from the infinite, or of matter from thought, the creation of the world, and the creation of man—these and kindred topics were debated constantly by the Grecian thinkers, without any one reaching a solution which satisfied the whole, or even any considerable number. With occasional flashes of light, and glimpses of beauty, radiant and eternal, the whole seems to most readers, an endless logomachy. One feels, while endeavoring to follow them, as if he were revolving on Ixion's wheel.

"In reviewing the history of Greek speculation," says Lewes, who has too much reason for the remark, "from the Water of Thales to the Absolute Negation of Plotinus, what a reflection is forced upon us of the vanity of metaphysics! So many years of laborious inquiry, so many splendid minds engaged, and after the lapse of ages, the inquiry remains the same, the answer more ingeniously absurd! Ah! truly was it said that metaphysics was *l'art de s'égarer avec méthode*."

Socrates was generally though not always practical. He was really more of a moralist than a metaphysician. Plato was speculative and transcendent; so much so that few have

---

\* This was the sentiment of all the ancient philosophers. Their feeling is well expressed by Horace, who says, "Odi profanum vulgus et arceo." The idea of teaching the common people, as such, rarely, if ever, occurred to their minds.

† Among them Sir William Hamilton, the first philosophical critic of the age. See Morell's *Hist. of the Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century*, p. 656.



ever pretended to understand him in all respects, and it is highly questionable whether he thoroughly understood himself. How God should reveal himself or create the universe, is a problem he constantly suggests but never solves. He speaks of the Supreme Being, the original absolute Essence or Idea, as inaccessible and incomprehensible. He consequently supposes the existence of another God in the outward universe, the Alter Ego, so to speak, of the Deity, the God manifested and embodied in finite forms. Occasionally he seems to present this second or manifested Deity as a mere abstraction or ideal, though generally as the soul of the universe, embodied, in the material whole.\* His followers, the Neo-Platonists of a later era, retained the distinction, and attempted to give it a more definite scientific expression. They departed, however, essentially from the views of Plato.†

Indeed, the idea seems to be founded, in some sense, in the nature of things, though inadequately and even erroneously expressed by Plato, and involving his speculations in inextricable difficulty. For now, he speaks of this cosmical Deity as if he were uncreated and eternal, and thence equal to the Supreme Intelligence, nay constituting the Supreme Intelligence, and then again as a sort of created and subaltern God. Still we must conceive of the absolute and eternal Essence, as manifested in the external universe, and thence limited, perhaps humanized. It is thus He discovers himself to us as a distinct personality. For we might well ask, how can the finite ever reach and comprehend the Infinite? and how, moreover, can the Infinite, who for this reason is the *one absolute, unconditioned and indivisible All*, create or produce the finite, the conditioned, the many? We believe the doctrine of course, nay we know from revelation, perhaps from intuition, that the fact so exists; but in philosophy, the question is *how* does it exist, nay *how can* it exist? How, in a word, (for thus the problem must present itself to the reason of a pagan philosopher,) how can the absolute and unchangeable Essence, who can never be more than he is, never less than he is, pass into or produce the external or multiform universe?

Plato's solution, if it may be called such, for it is only a hypothesis, involved him and his followers, both ancient and

---

\* For an extended account of the views of the Neo-Platonists, on the subject of the Trinity, see Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, ii., 735-40. Compare Ritter's *Ancient Philosophy*, vol. iv., pp. 521, 692.

† De Legibus, x., p. 697. Philebus, p. 30. Idem, pp. 170, 171.

modern, in a sort of ideal pantheism, which has taken the form sometimes of a profound spiritualism, though more frequently, perhaps, of an arid rationalism.

We have said "a sort of ideal pantheism," for it is only such by implication. His system may be described as emanative; for he has first the Supreme Reason, the Everlasting God, then the Kosmos or Universe, which also is a God, with soul and body, produced according to an eternal archetype, and in this sense eternal also, though in its present form a production of time; then inferior gods, who in their turn are also creators, and finally the souls and bodies of men.\* He believes that all things have their opposites; so if there be good there must be evil also, and so on, in which sense his system perhaps may be styled *dualistic* rather than *pantheistic*, though springing from an absolute unity, in which mind and matter, good and evil are involved, and thus verging, as the merest tyro can see, toward an ideal or spiritual pantheism. Plato, however, vacillates, both as to the origin of the material universe, and the origin of evil; for sometimes he seems to derive evil from matter, while matter itself is represented only as the grosser or more exterior form of that ethereal substance or essence which forms, so to speak, the body of God, or a kind of universal and eternal plenum, from which he produces all external things.

Souls or finite spirits also, according to Plato, are not created, but rather projected into formal or outward bodily existence, from which finally ascending, they will return to the immortal state.†

Thus the genius of Plato, held in the fetters of matter, yet tended to the spiritual and divine; and though his system, logically carried out, may be termed ideal, perhaps pantheistic, it certainly possessed this redeeming feature. His own lofty spirit longed for the perfect, the beautiful and good, in their absolute and eternal archetypes. God and immortality were the starting point, and the goal of his reasoning and his life. Yet the unsettled question ever recurs, How does God come to us, how do we come to God? He is ours, and we are his—but *how*?

To relieve his theory of its main difficulty, Plato, as we have stated, in addition to the one inaccessible and universal Reason, who forms the root of all existence, supposed a God of this world, a sort of divine Logos, as he is named, a

---

\* Plato's Cosmogony is developed chiefly in the *Timæus*. See especially the 8th to the 17th chapters inclusive.

† *Phædo*, 128. Compare *Phædrus*, 51-56-61

term given by St. John to Jesus Christ himself, as the Word, or manifestation of the invisible Father. But Plato's god of the world, or external universe, is a derived and limited deity, and can not therefore be made to cohere with any just ideas of the divine Unity.

This deity, however, in the Platonic philosophy, is simply the embodied soul of the universe, represented as a living creature. Plato's reasoning upon this subject is curious. The world has warmth, is composed of various elements, has motion like a human body, and so forth, therefore it must have a soul. "As soon as the soul, that image of the eternal gods, or ideas, the vast animal began to move; *God looked upon his work and was glad?*" Had Plato seen the Bible? See the *Timaeus*, cxiv. In the *Phaedrus*, (55,) he uses this remarkable language. "But the immortal derives its name from no deduction of reasoning; but as we neither see nor sufficiently understand God, we represent him as an *immortal animal*, possessed of soul as well as body, and these united together through all time." Here the idea is different from that in the *Timaeus*, which closes thus: "We are now at length to say, that our discourse concerning the universe has reached its conclusion; for, not only containing, but full of mortal and immortal animals, it has thus been formed, a visible animal, embracing things visible—a sensible (manifested?) god of the intelligible (spiritual?) the greatest, the best and most perfect—this one *only begotten universe*." Plato's universe is thus a *created god*, a god whom he worshiped, for he begins the *Critias* with imploring, "*that God, (the universe,) long, long ago created in fact, to confirm*" the truth of his recent discussion," etc.

On the same ground, and springing from the same speculative difficulty, he can not solve the question of the soul's immortality. He thoroughly believes it, and in the *Phaedo*, devoted to this particular discussion, he presents many ingenious arguments in its favor, though none of them can be regarded as demonstrative; and in the last analysis he is compelled to base it on the doctrine of the *metempsychosis*, including the preëxistence and transmigration of souls.\* Indeed Plato would seem to hold the past eternal existence of the soul in God, whence he deduces its future immortality. Its preëxistence he endeavors to prove by the doctrine or fact of reminiscence, an idea hinted at in Wordsworth's

---

\* *Phaedo*, 47, 48, 49. *Phaedrus*, 61, 62. See also *Timaeus*, clxxii.



beautiful ode entitled, "Intimations of Immortality, from Recollections of Early Childhood."

" Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting :  
 The soul that rises with us, our life's star,  
     *Hath had elsewhere its setting,*  
 And cometh from afar :  
     Not in entire forgetfulness  
     And not in utter nakedness  
 But trailing clouds of glory, do we come  
     From God who is our home."

Taken in some large poetic sense, all this is doubtless true ; for we do come from God as the fountain of our being ; but evidently we are creatures of time, so far at least as the past is concerned. Our souls, grand and capacious as they may become, have yet their specific, individual beginning, or creation ; and all back of this, in

" That immortal sea  
 Which brought us hither,"

is unknown and ineffable.

Plato, however, is not satisfied to deduce the immortality of the soul from its capacities and possibilities, and especially from those deep and beautiful harmonies and aspirations of which he so touchingly speaks ; he must go further ; he must solve the problem philosophically ; and hence back of all *a posteriori* considerations, back of all the facts of its present human existence, he boldly assumes the fact of its eternity, in other words, its absolute existence in God, from which its future immortality flows, as a natural and eternal necessity. And yet he seems to intimate the possibility of the destruction of bad souls ; one of those singular inconsistencies into which the profoundest intellects not unfrequently fall.\*

Logically carried out, as every thoughtful person must acknowledge, the doctrine of the eternity of the soul involves its divinity, in other words its identity with God. And as God, the infinite and immutable, can not consist of parts, and thence can neither be divided nor multiplied, the identity of the soul with God, would prove it God, and so pantheism would be the necessary logical result.†

The subject of the origin and duration of matter, to which

---

\* Phaedo, 130.

† It was on this ground that *Lessing*, a Spinozist, held the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls.

Plato frequently refers, is left as one might naturally suppose, in inextricable confusion. As a substantial, external thing, with its attributes of extension, divisibility, form, color, and so forth, he seems to regard it as simply phenomenal; and yet its basis, which he denominates *Hylé*, a sort of ethereal essence, contemporaneous with God, is regarded not simply as eternal, but occasionally as the seat of sin; so that on this ground he can not successfully solve the problem of human redemption, to us the most immediate and thrilling of all problems. He sees and laments the strange "necessity" (*ἀνάγκη*) which gives rise to sin and misery, that apparent duality and contradiction in the nature of things, and especially in the nature of man, which the Bible refers to the fall of the race from its primitive integrity; but his chief remedy is the renunciation of the outward and bodily, the contemplation of archetypal ideas, and a return, if possible, to the original and eternal essence.\* These things we know are echoes of the truth, as it were imperfect glimpses of the reality; but much was wanting which ancient philosophy never supplied. Indeed neither Plato nor any of the old speculative thinkers apprehended fully the nature of sin, as the voluntary lapse and transgression of the soul. They seemed to regard it as a natural and inevitable evil, for which there was no adequate cure, except in a return to absolute spiritual existence.† The idea of *redemption*, by a divine transformation, or regeneration of the soul, in its present limited and imperfect state, never dawned upon their minds. Plato evidently struggles with the dread necessity, and longs for emancipation, in the bosom of the Infinite, but gives no distinct information as to the method of its attainment. True he dwells upon the necessity of *goodness*, as the soul's eternal life. He speaks eloquently of virtue, as "the deepest and most beautiful of all harmonies," *μεγίστην καὶ καλλίστην τῶν συμφωνιῶν*, and so vaguely hints at the means of reunion with God; but perplexed with the fatal proclivity to evil, in the very constitution of the external world, and the physical nature of man, he fails to answer those two great questions which are ever pressing the race, *How shall man be just with God? how shall man become sinless and happy?*

Plato sees clearly enough that nature is a manifestation of God; but he perverts or altogether loses sight of the Divine personality. His only personal deity is the actual universe,

---

\* *Repub. L. vii.*, 1, 2.

† In the *Timæus*, (lxix.,) he says expressly that the soul is "rendered morbid and unwise by the body," and that "no one is voluntarily bad."

as a living creature, with its inner spirit and its external form, or, as he terms it, its body and soul. Thus he degrades the idea of the divine personality, making it commensurate, both in scope and duration, with the created universe. Leaving this however, he naturally passes into the idea of the infinite and absolute nature of God, and here actually loses, as he must, all conception of personality. His notions become abstract and misty; so that his eternal Essence or God, is found to be little more than an abstract idea or power, absolute and inaccessible, whom no man can know or love.\*

The fact is, the great truth of the personality of God, and the possibility of union and fellowship with him, as a distinct intelligence, and especially as a Father and Friend, wanted for its full expression and confirmation, an actual incarnation in some perfect, tangible form. This, while preserving the fundamental truth of the Divine unity and supremacy, would bring home to the intellect and the heart the idea of a personal God, distinct from the universe, with whom we might enter into relations of fellowship and love.

Yet Plato, as we see, clung to the fact of a divine manifestation, while incapable of realizing it in scientific form. It constituted indeed a pervading element of his system, and entered into all subsequent speculations concerned in his spirit. Nay, wherever in the history of the past, any approximation was made, either in philosophy or religion, to the great truth of a First Cause, the necessities of human nature uniformly removed this primal deity beyond the sphere not only of the senses, but of the mere finite intellect. The truth was held, as by a superior sense or faculty, as a great and unutterable reality; and intercourse with such a being, either on his side or on man's, was supposed possible only through some kind of intermediate power. For the same reason the outward creation and government of the universe was always ascribed, as among the oriental theosophers, to some emanating Essence or Deity, or as among the Platonists, to the Divine Logos, the Wisdom or Reason of the great Supreme, in the form not only of an abstraction, but of a *personality*. That is to say, a personal God, the only conceivable God, to them ever was but an image, reproduction, or manifestation of the one absolute and eternal Being.

This was the doctrine, in some form or other, of all the old religions, of all the Indian and Egyptian philosophies and

---

\* See upon this point, Ritter's *Hist. An. Ph.*, vol. ii., p. 287. Compare pp. 272, 273.



mythologies, of Magianism and of Platonism, though often appearing in a most imperfect, and even degrading form. This too was the doctrine of the Hebrew sages.\* Numerous passages might be cited from Philo Judaeus, born at Alexandria, in Egypt, only a few months before our Saviour, and par-excellence the philosopher of the Hebrews, on the impossibility that the self-existent Deity should become cognizable to the intellect or senses of man, and consequently that there must intervene between him and us some divine mediation, some eternal Logos, Reason or Word. Sometimes he speaks of this intermediate Divinity as the image, or still more adequately as the Shadow of God.† Nay he goes further, and maintains that as God is the prototype of the Word, so again the Word is the archetype of other things, and of man among the rest. It is on this ground that he describes the Deity as a light, which not only illuminates himself, but also emits ten thousand rays, which form the supra-sensible world of his energies, the *pleroma* or "fullness of him that filleth all in all."‡ So that the *Messiah* or Word, would be, as the Athanasian creed expresses it, *God of God*, and *Light of Light*, or as St. Paul more beautifully, "the effulgence of the Father's glory, and the express image of his nature."

Philo does not carry out the idea quite consistently, neither does he conform in all respects, either to the Platonic or the Hebrew conception.§ He mingles with it some conceits and refinements, which it is difficult to understand; and proposes to reunite man to the Deity by means of mental abstraction and theosophic mysticism.|| It is impossible also to say, whether he derived his ideas chiefly from Plato and the oriental theosophers, or from the ancient Scriptures. His method of interpreting the divine Oracles is allegorical. The literal and even natural sense he often rejects, or modifies at pleasure; and endeavors, like Origen and Swedenborg, to find the real import beneath external words, facts or appearances. His style is Grecian and Platonic; his ideas are oriental and mystical, though frequently beautiful and affecting. He pours contempt upon outward things, the sciences, and

---

\* For example, the Targumists, the earliest Jewish commentators on the Scriptures. Lightfoot, Schoetgen and others, have collected numerous passages in which the Messiah is represented under this idea. See some admirable remarks upon this point in the introduction to Tholuck's Commentary on John

† De Monarch, ii., 5. Leg. Alleg., ii., 31.

‡ Leg. Alleg. ii., The term here used is *παράδειγμα τῆς εἰκονος*.

§ De Cherub. xxviii., 156.

|| He rarely, if ever, gives the idea of a personal Messiah.

¶ Leg. Alleg., iii. 9, p. 93.

even political affairs, and dwells with infinite complacency on the excellence and happiness of a contemplative life.\* He praises especially the Therapeutae, or the Jewish anchorites of Egypt, who despised society, mortified the body, and endeavored, by strange ceremonies and mystic contemplation, to reunite themselves to the Deity.†

These notions exerted a great influence upon the Jews of Egypt, who had multiplied there exceedingly during the reign of the Ptolemies, so as to amount to something more than a million of souls. In subsequent times they mingled to some extent, with Christian ideas, and originated probably, the monastic life of the early Christian devotees, so numerous in that country.

But the belief of Plato and Philo in regard to the Logos, was cherished, in a somewhat different form perhaps, by the Jewish people, especially by their more thoughtful, religious teachers. He was called, as in the Old Testament Scriptures, the *Messiah*, or Anointed One, the *Shiloh* or Peacemaker, the *Divine Presence*, or the *Angel of His Presence*, who led them through the wilderness, the *Metatron* or *Mediator*, though most frequently the *Memra* or *Word*, for as a word is an outgoing or utterance of mind, an embodiment or manifestation of spirit, so they regarded the Messiah, for whose incarnation in the fullness of the times they constantly longed, as the embodiment or manifestation of Jehovah, as it were God personified, that is, revealed, in such limited but appropriate form as mortals might understand.

And it is a curious fact, which we may state in this connection, that this very appellation, Word or Reason, is found not only in the Hebrew, but in the Indian, the Persian, the Chinese and Egyptian philosophies and religions. In the Indian mythology, *Vach*, signifying speech, is the active power of *Brahma*. In the Egyptian hieroglyphics, *Amun* is the hidden God," while *Phtha*, the god of light, or fire, by whom he produces the world, is (as in the Rosetta stone) the *Apparent* or *Manifested God*. Hence the sovereigns of Egypt are styled "the beloved of Ptha." In the Persian religion, *Ormuzd*, the good, creates the universe by Honover, the *Word*. *Lao-tsue*, one of the Chinese sages, teaches the creation of the world by "*the Primordial Reason*."‡

---

\* See *De Vita Contemplativa*.

† *De Migra Abrahah*, 2, 3, 10, 11, compared with *De Vita Contemplativa*. In other places however, Philo rebukes the extreme asceticism and extravagant usages of the Therapeutae. See *Profugis*, 7.

‡ *La raison a produit un, un a produit deux, deux a produit trois, trois a produit toutes choses.* *Memoire sur la vie et les Ouvrages de Laotseu, par M. Abel Remusat.*

The same term may also be traced in some of the most ancient poets, a tradition doubtless of some primeval revelation, if not an intuitive conviction of the human mind. Passages of this kind are cited by Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and others, and though liable to some suspicion on the score of genuineness, are not to be utterly rejected. We do not indeed urge them as authority here, for they require to be sifted by a thorough and candid criticism.\* It is enough here to say, that Philo-Judaeus, as also the early Christian fathers, uniformly, and with considerable plausibility, maintain that amid many errors of views, the ancient writers, poets and philosophers, derived the knowledge of one eternal God, and one eternal Word or Reason, by whom the worlds were created, from the sacred Scriptures, or from some original revelation, and thence though bewildered by superstition, bore testimony to the fundamental principles of religion. The light shone upon them, as through broken clouds, often lost out of sight, and anon reappearing amid the drifting shadows.

Hence," says Clement, "if the truth be but one, however numerous the modes of error, we may suppose the different schools of philosophy, barbarian as well as Greek, seizing on it as the Bacchantes seized on Pentheus, and having torn it to pieces, each bearing off a part, and then boasting itself of possessing the whole. Yet I think the dawn of that light in the east, illuminated them all; for it may be proved that all who sincerely sought after the truth, whether Greeks or barbarians, did in fact carry off, in some cases, not a little of the truth which they sought, the fragments of which, being collected and reunited, the perfect Logos (Reason) or truth is then fully seen and known; for he who can with propriety be called a Christian philosopher, must be imbued with all knowledge."†

Plutarch, one of the best of the ancient thinkers and moralists, at a later day than Orpheus and Plato, in his treatise on the *Osiris*, or Sun-god of Egypt, the symbol as he deems it, of an eternal sun, has a similar conception. While recognizing the superior and universal Reason or Mind, as the fountain of all existence, he speaks of him as inaccessible and incomprehensible, except through some external manifestation, like that of the embodied Logos.‡

Doubtless all the symbols and duties of the ancient pagan

---

\* See Justin's "Cohortatio ad Graecos," 15. (Ottos' Ed., vol. i., p. 53.)

† Stromata, lib. i., c. 13.

‡ Ritter's Ancient Ph., vol. iv., p. 497.



sages and religionists, were false, or at least inadequate; nay, many of them bestial and bewildering, the fruit of superstition and fancy. Perhaps none of them ever rose to the true conception of the Divine Logos, or Reason, and all were liable to lose sight of the spiritual and divine, in the carnal and terrene. Yet they felt the need, as many now feel the need, of some special manifestation of the Deity, over and above that of nature, which might meet the wants of man, and which, while bringing down the Infinite to the level of the soul, might at the same time lift the soul to the level of the Infinite.

And what can all this be but the general acquiescence of the human mind in the necessity of some Divine Mediator, some celestial Messiah, or Son of God, who should reunite the extremes of heaven and earth, of man and God, and so bring the Deity, the great Father of us all, within the sphere and compass of human thought and affection?\*

But philosophy, both ancient and modern, has only hovered around the problem, never solved it, and nothing can equal the bewilderment of the heathen mind in regard to this and kindred questions.† The difficulty so far from being diminished, was only deepened by time. Where it did not find its issue in a sort of philosophic Stoicism, or in absolute scepticism, as it often did, it became an agony of desire, which could be satisfied only with the divine reality.

The case of Clemens, a noble Roman, will illustrate what we mean, and show how philosophy, with its high imaginings and strange perplexities, was a means of preparing the soul for Christ. In the commencement of his book, entitled *Recognitiones*, he gives a most interesting account of his mental struggles, and subsequent conversion to Christianity, beginning, "Ego Clemens in urbe Roma nata," etc. A considerable portion of his narrative may be found in Neander's Church History, vol. i., pp. 32, 33, admirably translated by Professor Torrey. All we can give here is a condensed abstract. From his youth he was haunted with the questions which had entered his soul, he hardly knew how:—

\* A striking passage as to the necessity of a Mediator, even on natural grounds, may be seen in Bacon's Works, ii., p. 407.

† The same bewilderment is visible among the philosophers of modern Europe. The whole problem of the German and French Ontology, developed in the writings of Leibnitz, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling and Cousin, is the relation of *subject* and *object*, and at a higher point, of the *finite* and *infinite*. With them the absolute Essence ever images or reproduces himself in the *finite*; so that they are compelled to believe in a certain Trinity. The idea is brought out very strikingly by Schelling and Cousin. See Schelling's *Philosophie und Religion*, pp. 23-30. Cousin "Histoire de la Philos. Intro.," p. 95.

"Will my existence terminate with death? What will be my fate then? Will it be as if I had never been born? When and how was the world created? What existed before it? Will it end, and if so, what will then take place?" Incessantly agitated by such questionings and doubts, he grew pale and emaciated, little aware, as he tells us, that he had a celestial friend guiding him to truth and peace. He tried to rid himself of his anxiety, but found it impossible. He attended the schools of philosophy, but without satisfaction. He saw nothing but endless and ever varying notions, "building up and tearing down of theories." He was driven to and fro, now hoping and then despairing, now believing, and anon doubting the immortality of the soul. His case grew worse. He then resolved to visit Egypt, the land of mysteries and apparitions, and hunt up a magician who might summon for him a spirit from the other world. The appearance of such a spirit would give him demonstrative evidence of the soul's immortality; and he should never again be permitted to doubt. But a philosophic friend advised him against this course, as unlawful and undesirable. In this state of mind, full of doubts, undecided, inquiring, agitated and distressed, he came in contact with the Gospel, preached in demonstration of the Spirit. His doubts were dispelled, his mind was enlightened, his heart was renewed. He found God, and immortality in Christ, and rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Very similar to this was the conversion of Justin Martyr, who though born in Flavia Neapolis, was educated in the religious belief of the Greeks, to which his parents belonged. He was fond of study, and especially attached to the Greek poets and philosophers. In the beginning of his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, he describes his hopes and disappointments in the study of the Greek philosophy, and shows how he obtained certainty and truth only in the Christian religion. He first joined himself to a disciple of the Stoa, but soon left him with bitter disappointment, because his teacher could say little or nothing of that Deity whose nature he so much longed to know. With a Peripatetic he had still less success, for he found under the cloak of the philosopher a sordid love of gain. This however did not abate his confidence in philosophy, and so he betook himself to a Pythagorean, who rang changes upon the glories of music, geometry and astronomy, as essential to all elevated spiritual attainments, and finally excluded Justin from his teachings, because he professed ignorance upon these subjects. Justin almost despaired of attaining the truth in this way, when he learned

that a noted Platonist had opened a school in the place where he was sojourning, with whom he resolved to make one more attempt to attain the object of his wishes. Here he was not altogether disappointed, for the conversations of the philosopher furnished his mind with the richest materials of thought. He was much impressed with the symmetry and grandeur of the Platonic system, and especially with its ideal and spiritual tone. His philosophic knowledge increased daily, and he thought himself on the verge of consummating his Platonic attainments, by the direct intuition of the Deity.

In this state of mind, he was wandering, one day, in a lonely spot by the sea-shore, where he was unexpectedly joined by a venerable man, of gentle and imposing aspect, supposed by some to have been a philosophically educated Jewish Christian, by others the Bishop Polycarp. This good man informed him, that he had come down to the beach to wait for some absent relatives, whose return he was anxiously expecting. Justin could not resist the temptation of communicating his thoughts to the venerable man, informing him that he had repaired to that spot for philosophical speculation. "You are a lover then of discourse, (*Φιλόλογος*,) but no lover of deeds, (*Φιλεργος*,) nor by any means a lover of truth; for you do not try to be a practical man, but rather an ingenious disputant." To this Justin demurred, affirming that nothing could be more worthy of a man than to make it manifest that all things were governed by intelligence, and to detect the undivine and the erroneous in all other pursuits, that philosophy was the true source of wisdom, and ought to receive the homage of all.

The aged man inquired how philosophy led to happiness, and what was its proper definition. Being told that it was "the science of being, and the knowledge of the truth, happiness being the reward of this knowledge and wisdom," he showed that philosophy, when it depended upon its unaided resources, could never solve the problem. For, the knowledge of God, the highest object of all, and especially of Platonic speculation, could never be acquired by an empirical or formal method, or by discursive contemplation, like music, arithmetic or astronomy. He proved that God himself must teach us, through some divine medium, to which philosophy could make no pretensions. Reason, indeed, might ascertain the truth of the divine existence, and moral principles; but could not behold the essence of God. Besides, according to a postulate of the Platonic philosophy itself, only the pure and righteous can attain to the actual vision of God; so that the



reason or intellect plays but a subordinate part. "The pure in heart shall see God."

He then dwelt upon the errors of the Platonic philosophy, especially with reference to the doctrine of the metempsychosis and the immortality of the soul; since the former was absolutely useless, teaching that while wicked men passed into the bodies of brutes, they had no consciousness of their former aberrations, nor any sense of their present degradation. As to the immortality of the soul, he showed, that it was founded by the Platonics, on the *assumption* of its absolute and eternal nature, and involved not simply its future but its past eternal existence. The soul indeed, created in the image of God, is capable of immortality, and is then susceptible of future reward or punishment. Hence it endures, in order to realize the idea of retribution, not only from its own nature, but through the will and power of him who gave it existence.

Justin was profoundly impressed by the wisdom and eloquence of the venerable man. He began to lose confidence in his philosophical speculations. "What then shall we do," was his exclamation; "on what teacher can we rely, and from what quarter derive infallible truth?" He was directed to the prophets, "organs of the Divine Spirit," and especially to "Christ, the way, the truth and the life." The old man then left him, and he saw him no more. Eagerly he sought the Scriptures, and the instructions of those known as the friends of Christ. And there he found what he sought, truth and rest, God and immortality.\*

It may be concluded then, that ancient philosophy was a longing and a preparation for Christ. "For it appears to me," said *Simmius*, in *Phaedo*, addressing himself to Socrates, who concedes the correctness of the statement, "that to know them (the truths pertaining to the soul and its destiny) clearly in the present life, is either impossible or very difficult: on the other hand, not to test what has been said of them in every possible way, to investigate the whole matter, and exhaust upon it every effort, is the part of a very weak man. For we ought, in respect to these things, either to learn from others how they stand, or to discover them for ourselves; or if both these are impossible, then taking the best of human reasonings, that which appears the best supported, and embarking on that, as one who risks himself upon a raft, so to sail through life; unless one could be carried

---

\* For a more extended account of Justin's conversion, see Semisch's "Life, Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr."

more safely, or with less risk, on *a surer conveyance*, or some DIVINE (Logos) REASON.”\*

Hence also, in the Second Alcibiades, we have the still more remarkable declaration, “That we must wait patiently until some one, either *a god* or some *inspired* man, teach us our moral and religious duties, and as Pallas in Homer did to Diomed, remove the darkness from our eyes.”†

---

## ART. II.—SOUL-LIBERTY.‡

THE DEBT OF THE WORLD TO ITS CHAMPIONS AND DEFENDERS.

BY JOHN DOWLING, D. D.

THE expressive word SOUL-LIBERTY is borrowed from the following declaration of its noblest champion, written more than two centuries ago. “As the civil permission of all the consciences and worship of all men in things merely spiritual,” said Roger Williams, “is no ways inconsistent with true Christianity and true civility; so it is the duty of the magistrate to suppress all violences to the bodies and goods of men for their souls’ belief; and to provide that not one person in the land be restrained from, or constrained to any worship, ministry or maintenance; but peaceably maintained in his SOUL-LIBERTY, as well as corporal freedom.”§

In the memoir of the founder of religious freedom in America, by that ornament of the Baptist denomination in New England, the beloved and lamented Knowles, we are furnished at once with a most brilliant illustration and triumphant defense of this doctrine of soul-liberty. The author, no less than the hero of that work, has won for himself an illustrious position among its champions and defenders, to whom not only the denomination which they adorned, but the world owe a debt of admiration and of gratitude.

We know not where can be found, a statement and de-

---

\* Plato’s Phædo, 78.

† Alcib., ii., 150.

‡ The substance of the present article was delivered as the annual address before the Knowles Rhetorical Society of Newton Theological Institution, on Tuesday, June 29th, 1852. The topic was suggested to the mind of the author by that conspicuous trait in the character of the lamented Knowles, from whom this Society is named—his ardent attachment to the cause of *soul-liberty*, or the rights of conscience, as seen in that noblest performance of his literary life, “The Memoir of Roger Williams.”

§ Roger Williams’ Hireling Ministry, page 36.

fense of the doctrine of soul-liberty, at once so concise, so transparent, and so perfectly conclusive, as the brief episode of four pages, in which the author forsakes, for a moment, the thread of his history, in order, as he modestly professes, "briefly to state the general principles of liberty of conscience." The conclusion to which he arrives may be quoted, as an accurate statement of the doctrine which has ever been held by the Baptists, and of which, in their treatment of their fellow-men, the world may be challenged to convict them of a violation. It is in these words: "The great and true principle, then, is that men are not responsible to each other for their religious opinions or practices, as such, and that every man has a right, as a citizen, to hold any opinions, and to practice any ceremonies which he pleases, unless he disturbs the civil peace. And the duty of the magistrate in relation to religion, consists in personal obedience to the truth, and impartial protection to all the citizens in the exercise of their religious privileges."

The mode of argument by which Mr. Knowles establishes this principle, is a condensation of the more diffuse, but equally conclusive reasoning of Williams. It is clear, direct, unanswerable. While reading, one is almost tempted to doubt the distinction between moral evidence and mathematical proof, so irresistibly is he impelled to the conviction, as by the force of a series of axioms, that liberty of conscience is the inalienable right of every man, and that

"Consciences and souls were made  
To be the Lord's alone."

This then, is what we mean by the doctrine of soul-liberty; and the noble men who have written or suffered in its defense, especially in an age when it was almost universally regarded as an innovation and a heresy, are worthy of being held in everlasting remembrance as its champions and its heroes—illustrious friends of humanity, and self-sacrificing benefactors of their race. We claim this as preëminently a Baptist doctrine; avowed and defended by Baptists, when nearly all the rest of the world were its opposers; and necessarily springing from their peculiar and distinguishing principle of personal responsibility before God. We do but reiterate the doctrine of our fathers, when we affirm that no man has the right, under the gospel dispensation, to anticipate, to supplant, or to control the action of another's conscience, or to compel him to the profession of any religious creed, or the submission to any religious rite, except as the result of his own intelligent conviction and voluntary choice.



We agree with the clear and discriminating views of one of our living writers that it is an interference with "the position and peculiarities of Baptists"—"where another performs for me a religious act, without my knowledge or consent, and with the expectation that I shall subsequently make that act my own."\* And hence, we are not surprised at the question once put by a young convert, convinced of the duty of believer's baptism, when the attempt was made to dissuade him from that sacred ordinance, upon the ground that he had been baptized in his infancy—"Was it right, dear parents, to deprive me, in this solemn matter, of the liberty of choice?"

With *our* views of the rights of conscience, we confess we can not perceive the justice of such an interference with its mature decisions. Baptism is a religious act. Under the gospel dispensation, religion is a personal matter between God and the conscience. What natural, or moral, or scriptural right, then, has any one—whether monarch or magistrate, pastor or parent—to deprive me of my inalienable right of liberty of choice—to perform for me, an act for which I alone am responsible, and then, to control my freedom by pleading an engagement, in which I had no voluntary agency. They may enlighten, and instruct and persuade—and, if possible convince;—but they have no right to anticipate my conviction; they have no power to compel.

Holding such views of personal and individual responsibility in matters of religion, strange indeed would it be if Baptists could ever have consented to sanction the employment of secular power, in violating the freedom of individual choice. If it is an invasion of freedom to anticipate or supplant the decision of conscience in an infant, then we argue, it is certainly not less so, to control the decision of conscience in an adult. How then can a Baptist be true to his principles, and sanction, for a moment, the employment of force in matters of religion? Who does not perceive that the conclusion is inevitable, that a Baptist must first renounce his principles and abandon his creed, or he can never be guilty of the iniquity and the absurdity of persecution for conscience' sake.

The doctrine of religious liberty, seems now, at least in this country, to be popular with all; except perhaps in those recently annexed territories, where Popery has had a century or more of uninterrupted sway, to enslave the minds and to dwarf the intellects of the people. The very air of this glori-

---

\* Position and Peculiarities of Baptists, by Sewel S. Cutting, p. 20.

ous western land seems to be redolent with freedom, except where the scarlet-robed harlot of Rome has blasted its verdure with her footstep, and poisoned its atmosphere with her breath. In the older states, where, notwithstanding the presence of a million of Roman Catholics, the popish element has been absorbed and swallowed up in the Protestant; all, with but here and there a solitary exception, are the professed friends of religious freedom, and no one can hope for the popular suffrage, who will not *appear* to submit to the popular voice. And hence, it has happened, that the singular spectacle has recently been presented to us, in our great metropolis, of a dignitary of that church which has ever been drunk with the blood of the saints; a servant and subject of that pope who pronounces "liberty of conscience" a "pestilential error;" a man too, who has himself taken a solemn oath to "persecute and oppose to the utmost of his power all heretics, schismatics, and rebels against his said lord, the pope;" of such a man, standing up in his archiepiscopal robes, before a gaping crowd, to sing peans in honor of religious freedom (!) and to claim, forsooth, for a son of his own church, the honor of first planting the flag of liberty of conscience on the shores of the western world; and then, of that same prelate returning to his study to devise new plans for extending over Protestant America, the same kind of *freedom* as that which *blesses* the inhabitants of Mexico, New Grenada, or Brazil; of France, Austria, or Rome.

Let it never be forgotten that he only can be regarded as a worthy champion or a true friend of religious liberty, who desires, and would do all in his power that this blessing should be extended to every land, and be the inheritance, as it is the right, of every human being. If religious liberty is right in one country, it is right in all. If, as the archbishop maintained, it is a blessed thing that no pretensions to religious ascendancy can be entertained or admitted in these United States, then would it not be a far more blessed thing if no such pretensions could be set up *any where*? If absolute religious freedom is so beneficent and proper *here*, would it not be equally so in Spain, or Austria, or Rome? If it is, in truth, and not mere pretense, cause of congratulation and joy to this Catholic prelate, that, in the United States, the press is unshackled, conscience is free, and liberty of opinion enjoyed by all—then, why did that prelate's master, in Rome, speak of the liberty of the press as "never-to-be-sufficiently-execrated," and of "unbridled liberty of opinion" as "that pest, of all others, most to be dreaded, in a state?"\* and why

---

\* See the Pope's Encyclical letter of 1832.

does that same prelate himself, when in Rome, as in duty bound, say amen to his doctrines, and kiss his foot, in token of submission to his person and decrees?

Would you know what Rome truly thinks of religious liberty, when she throws aside the mask;—listen to the following exposition from one of her chosen organs:—"Religious liberty," says this Romish writer, "in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his own religion, is one of the most wicked delusions ever foisted upon this age by the father of all deceit. The very name of liberty, except in the sense of a permission to do certain definite acts, ought to be banished from the domain of religion. \* \* \* \* Shall I, therefore, fall in with this abominable delusion? Shall I foster that damnable doctrine that Socinianism, and Calvinism, and Anglicanism, and Judaism, are not every one of them mortal sins, *like murder and adultery*? Shall I hold out hopes to my erring Protestant brother, that I will not meddle with his creed, if he will not meddle with mine? Shall I tempt him to forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, or my house, or my life-blood? No," says this plain-spoken Romanist, "*Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds*. It is intolerance itself, for it is the truth itself."\*

The frankness of the Catholic writer we have just quoted, in avowing the true doctrine of his church, on this subject, is, at least, worthy of praise; and if the prelates and priests of the same church in this country, would imitate the candor of the English writer, rather than the duplicity of the Irish archbishop of New York, in declaring their true sentiments upon religious liberty; then are we very sure, there need be no fear of the ultimate triumph of such a system, in free, enlightened, and happy America.

The doctrine of soul-liberty always has had, and still has its opposers. Let the papist, true to his system, brand "liberty of conscience" with Pope Gregory XVI. as a "most pestilential error." Let the semi-papist, already more than half-way toward the seven-hilled city, look down with ill-disguised contempt upon "the sects," and long for another Laud, and another star-chamber, to punish their presumption, and, if possible, to extinguish all but "THE CHURCH." Let the nominally Protestant adherent of a state church, assume the presumptuous right of *toleration* toward those whom he scornfully calls "dissenters"—while he fattens upon the tithes

---

\* From a recent number of the "Rambler," one of the principal organs of Romanism in England.



wrung from the sweat and toil of those who groan beneath his abhorred yoke of church and state. But every true friend of freedom will reject the base alliance, drive from his vocabulary the very word *toleration*, as assuming a prerogative which belongs only to Deity; and will claim for himself, what he acknowledges to be alike the inheritance of all, the right of thinking for himself upon all matters of religion, and of worshipping God according as his own individual conscience shall dictate; and that too, without being compelled to purchase from any government or hierarchy, the privilege of enjoying this inalienable right.

The province of private judgment, Baptists hold to be a sacred inclosure, where it is the privilege of every man, alone to commune with his own heart and with his God, free from all human interference or molestation; and at the sound of the first footfall, intruding on that sacred precinct, whether the intruder be armed with the sword or the faggot, the fetter or the tithe-bill, we exclaim, with indignation and horror, in the words of Virgil's priest of the Eleusinian mysteries—

“Procul hinc! procul este, profani  
\* \* \* Totoque absistite luco.”

The inquiry has, of late become increasingly interesting, since the popularity of the doctrine has increased the number of claimants for the honor, who, in modern Christendom may bear away the palm, as the pioneer champions of this glorious doctrine of soul-liberty, or of the right of every man, so far as human governments are concerned, to his own convictions and thoughts upon the subject of religion. We say, the champions, in *modern* Christendom, for sure we are that no Christian in apostolic and primitive times, could be found guilty of the daring presumption of persecuting for conscience' sake.

The doctrine of the apostles may be expressed in the words of Paul—“who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth.”\* The doctrine of the early Christian fathers may be expressed in the words of Tertullian—“*Humani juris et naturalis potestatis, unicuique quod putaverit calere. Sed nec religionis est cogere religionem, quæ suscipi sponte debet, non vi.*”† “It is the natural civil right of every one to worship whatever he may think

---

\* Romans xiv. 14.

† See the epistle dedicatory to Jeremy Taylor's “*Liberty of Prophesying*,” page 1, where this passage is quoted from Tertullian.

(right.) Nor is it the office of religion to force religion, which must be received voluntarily, not by force."

It was not till Christianity was corrupted by alliance with the state, and thus a foundation was laid for the full establishment of Popery, that professed Christians were found, who could be guilty of the folly of attempting to disseminate religion by coercive measures; yet so rapid was the establishment of the persecuting dogma, after this unholy and anti-christian alliance, that for more than a thousand years, and especially during the dark and dreary night of the middle ages, when Popery reigned despot of the world, it seemed to be a generally admitted axiom throughout almost all Christendom, that it was right to punish heresy with scourging, or imprisonment, or death; and the only exceptions to this general defection were those whom a haughty and corrupt hierarchy branded as heretics, but who were, notwithstanding, "men of whom the world was not worthy," although, like the ancient saints, "they wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth, being destitute, afflicted, tormented."\*

So deep was the darkness that had brooded for ages over the world, that the dawn of the reformation was insufficient to dissipate the gloom. Even the noble reformers of the sixteenth century, both on the continent and in England, seemed unable to shake off this relic of Popery; and stained the glory of the work they achieved by perpetuating the unholy alliance of church and state, and, in some instances, acting out the papal axioms they had imbibed in their childhood, by deeds of violence and blood. It is no wonder, therefore, that Protestant, as well as papal sovereigns should have retained the persecuting creed, and become alike involved in the guilt. The testimony of history shows that such was indeed the fact. Although Henry VIII. of England threw off the tyrannical yoke of the papacy, he was far from renouncing the papal doctrine of persecution; for he soon began to imprison or to burn the heretics, whether papists or Puritans, who refused to acknowledge his sovereignty, as lord of the conscience, or to swear allegiance to him, as the head of the English church, and virtually pope in his own dominions. If the popish "bloody Mary" kindled the fires of Smithfield and Oxford, for the holy martyrs who rejected the papal supremacy or the real presence, her example was followed by her Protestant, but scarcely less tyrannical sister Elizabeth, who soon began to practice similar enormities upon those who

---

\* Hebrews xi. 37, 38.

refused to accept her creed, to recite her liturgy, or to attend her churches.

At the commencement of the following century, when the Stuarts had succeeded to the throne of the Tudors, the same intolerance prevailed, and compelled thousands of conscientious disciples of Christ to fly to distant shores in search of freedom to worship God. Even the exiled Puritans of New England, driven to seek an asylum from oppression in the western wilds, soon turned the weapons of intolerance and persecution against their fellow-pilgrims, and verily thought they were doing God service. The papal doctrine which they brought with them across the Atlantic, that heresy ought to be punished with the sword, was less the error of the men, than of the age in which they lived. And it may tend to lessen the severity of our condemnation of the otherwise excellent John Cotton, and his associates in New England, to remember that the same error was embraced and advocated in Old England, by the pious and devoted Richard Baxter, Edmund Calamy, and, at one time, even by Jeremy Taylor.

In their age, nearly the whole Christian world seem to have been agreed in the doctrine that *heresy* ought to be punished, and to have differed only as to the meaning of the term. Previous to the emigration of the New England pilgrim fathers in 1620, a few feeble *Anabaptists*, as they were then reproachfully called in the father-land, had alone dared to employ their pens against the persecuting dogma, and to claim the right of worshiping God according to their consciences. These noble testimonies, however, for truth and soul-liberty, had either never been seen by the Puritan settlers of New England, with the exception, probably, of Roger Williams, or if seen had failed to produce conviction or assent.

Who then, we ask, are entitled to the honor of being regarded as the pioneers, in modern times, in reviving the ancient and primitive doctrine of liberty of conscience? This honor has been claimed for Lord Baltimore, or rather Sir Leonard Calvert, of Maryland, for Jeremy Taylor, of England, and for Roger Williams, of Rhode Island. We introduce a fourth party, as more justly entitled to the distinction than either, Leonard Busher and his "Anabaptist" associates, who, in the early part of the reign of the first James of England, battled nobly for freedom of conscience, while Williams and Taylor were yet in their boyhood.

Far be it from us to deny the honor that is justly due to each of the two first named enlightened men, who towered far above the age which produced them, in their views on this



subject; and yet we are compelled by historical fidelity, to maintain the proud preëminence of Roger Williams over both of his cotemporaries, as the champion of the rights of conscience. Still, we believe that neither Taylor, nor Calvert, nor Williams, is strictly entitled to the honor of being "the first in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude the doctrine of liberty of conscience." It may be difficult to fix, with absolute certainty, upon any man, at this distance of time, to whom this proud preëminence specially belongs; but whatever be the name of the modern pioneer of soul-liberty, he has shared the fate of the noble poet of the Grecian epic, neglected, and perhaps unknown while he lived, but millions uniting to do him honor, and nations contending for the glory of his birth, after his death. We shall attempt, as nearly as possible, to give honor to whom honor is due; and who will not say with us—

"*Palmarum qui meruit, ferat.*"

The over-generous statement of an eminent living historian, has been often quoted, that Roger Williams was "the first in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude, the doctrine of liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law, and, in its defense, he was the harbinger of Milton, the precursor and superior of Jeremy Taylor."\*

The value of this honorable testimony to the Baptist hero of soul-liberty would have been greater had not Mr. Bancroft incurred the suspicion of wishing to conciliate the prevailing Christian sects, by highly wrought eulogies of their favorite men; and had he been less extravagant in his statements of the kind and degree of religious liberty established by the Catholics of Maryland. If we supposed there was as much coloring in his account of Roger Williams and the settlement of Rhode Island, as there is in his account of the Calvert family and the settlement of Maryland, we should attach very little historical value to the one or the other. In the department of history we value the plain unvarnished facts much more highly than the gilding which surrounds them, and for this reason, we can not avoid a preference for Hildreth's simple, perspicuous and accurate account of the settlement of Maryland, to the eloquent but sometimes inflated and poetical narrative of Bancroft.

Nor is Bancroft's eulogy upon Roger Williams in strict accordance with truth. Had it been said that Williams was

---

\* Bancroft's History of the United States, vol. i., p. 375.

the first to assert, in its plenitude, this doctrine, not "in modern Christendom," but on the western continent, the historian would have expressed an indisputable historical fact. Were it the meaning of the historian that Roger Williams was "the first," not in the order of *time*, but in the order of *rank*, in the age in which he lived, in the defense of religious liberty; then would we cordially assent to the truth of the assertion, and hold ourselves in readiness to defend the justice of the claim. For we are proud to admit that previous to the appearance in 1644, of Roger Williams's celebrated work, entitled "the Bloody tenet of persecution for cause of conscience discussed," no treatise had been published in defense of the rights of conscience, at once so full, so complete, and so able; nor perhaps, since that time, with the single exception of the Baptist Delaune's celebrated "Plea for Nonconformists," written in the year 1683, some forty years later.

To Roger Williams unquestionably belongs the honor of being the pioneer champion of religious freedom in America; although the attempt has lately been made to transfer the laurels he fairly won, from his own brow to that of the Catholic founder of Maryland. Let us proceed to examine the justice of this claim.

In a recent discourse of Archbishop Hughes,\* the orator says, "If civil, but especially religious liberty be a clear and justly cherished privilege of the American people, the palm of having been the first to preach and practice it is due, beyond all controversy, to the Catholic colony of Maryland." In another place he says—"Far be it from me to diminish, by one iota, the merit that is claimed for Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and perhaps other states, on the score of having proclaimed religious freedom; but the Catholics of Maryland, by priority of time, have borne away the prize." Now, we ask, can this claim be fairly made out? Is it true that religious liberty, in the full sense of the word, was, first on this continent, preached and practiced in the Catholic colony of Maryland?

Nothing is more evident to the student of history than that Popery has been marked, in every age of its existence, by intolerance and persecution. The decrees of councils, the invectives of popes and the solemn oaths of prelates, no less than the dungeons of the inquisition, the fires of the auto-da-fé, or the recent cruel banishment of the exiles of Zillerthal or Madeira, all proclaim that persecution is an essential ele-

---

\* "The Catholic Chapter in the History of the United States," published by Edward Dunigan. New York, 1852.

ment of the system, and liberty of conscience, in their view, a detestable heresy. If then, the noble family of the Calverts possessed that inherent love for religious freedom which is claimed for them, and which, it is said, they incorporated in the constitution and laws of the Maryland settlement, then were they dissenters from the standard creeds and catechisms of Romanism, and stood absolutely alone, as rulers, in the history of the church which claims them as her sons; and were entitled to the classical description which Dr. Hughes applies to successful Catholic aspirants for legislative or senatorial honors.

“*Rari nantes in gurgite vasto.*”

Now we are by no means disposed to deny to the Catholic founders of Maryland, the honor which is justly their due. We believe them to have been far in advance of their age, and towering entirely above their church, in their views of religious toleration—though repudiating, but in part, her doctrine of persecution for conscience’ sake. And yet we maintain, that so far as appears from the laws relative to religious freedom passed in the new colony, its founders had not learned even the alphabet of the glorious doctrine of soul-liberty, as understood and established by the Baptist founder of Rhode Island, and generally admitted by American Protestants at the present day.

Let it be granted, as it may be, that Leonard Calvert\* pitched his tent upon the banks of the Potomac, some two years earlier than Roger Williams founded the town of Providence. Does this prove that “the Catholics of Maryland, by priority of time, have borne away the prize” as the founders of religious liberty? Is it at all surprising that the Catholics of Maryland, owing allegiance, as they did, to a Protestant king, should hesitate to follow out the maxims of their church, in torturing or burning the heretics, who might profess the same faith as the sovereign who had granted their charter, and who, they very well knew, could revoke that in-

---

\* Dr. Hughes speaks of Lord Baltimore as the actual settler of Maryland. This is incorrect. The first Lord Baltimore, Sir George Calvert, obtained the consent of king Charles I. to a charter which he is supposed himself to have drawn up, in the year 1632. By this charter, “Christianity was made the law of the land, but no preference was given to any sect.” Bancroft, vol. i., ch. 7. Before the patent could be finally adjusted, the first Lord Baltimore died; and it was again drawn in the name of his eldest son Cecil, the second Lord Baltimore, who appointed his brother Leonard Calvert his lieutenant, who thus became the actual settler of Maryland. See “Biographies of the early discoverers of America,” by Jeremy Belknap, D. D.



strument with a stroke of his pen, as easily as he had signed it. At the time when the Maryland charter was obtained, Catholics were subject to civil disabilities in England. Is it at all surprising that they should obtain a charter, which should protect them, in the event of Protestant ascendancy, which soon actually occurred, from the same annoyances in the colony, as those to which they were unjustly exposed at home? And, if these Catholic colonists had had the boldness to ask a charter which should protect themselves from persecution, but should give them the privilege of persecuting all who professed the same faith as his majesty, is it at all likely that a Protestant king would have granted their request? The idea is preposterous. They had no alternative. Christianity was made the law of the land, and *all whom they should acknowledge as Christians*, were to enjoy an equality of civil rights and privileges.

In considering the question of priority of time, too, we are to inquire not when the foot of the emigrant was first planted on the stranger soil; but, when was *the first law* passed in relation to religious liberty? In Maryland, the first and boasted law, such as it was, was passed in 1649. In Rhode Island, a code of civil laws was adopted in 1647, closing with the following noble avowal of entire religious liberty to all: "Otherwise than this, what is herein forbidden, all men may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God. And let the lambs of the Most High walk in this colony without molestation, in the name of Jehovah their God, for ever and ever." And this glorious declaration of soul-liberty in Baptist Rhode Island, be it remembered, was enacted two years before the first law on the subject in Catholic Maryland.

But supposing that the facts had been different, and the law of Maryland had been prior to that of Rhode Island; would that have justified the assertion that, in the establishment of religious liberty in America, "the Catholics of Maryland have borne away the prize." Hear, and then judge. Listen to the very language of this boasted law, and then say, are we not right in asserting that the framers of *such a law* had not learned even the alphabet of religious freedom, or soul-liberty?

By this law, *first*, "Blasphemy against God, denying our Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or denying the holy Trinity, or the godhead of the three persons, was to be punished with DEATH, and confiscation of lands and goods to the Lord proprietary."

Probably some exceedingly charitable Protestants, who

from having heard this tale of Maryland Catholic liberty, so oft reiterated, have taken for granted that a story so often repeated must be true, will be surprised, when they learn from the above that, under the provisions of this law, such ornaments of America as the eloquent and pure-minded William Channing, the accomplished statesman and scholar, Edward Everett, or the erudite historians, Jared Sparks, or *George Bancroft himself*, might be hanged on a gibbet, or burned at a stake, for exercising their inalienable civil right of private judgment in matters of religion.

By this law, *secondly*, "persons using any reproachful word or speeches concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of our Saviour; or the holy apostles or evangelists, or any of them—for the first offense to forfeit five pounds sterling to the lord proprietary, or in default of payment, to be publicly whipped and imprisoned, at the pleasure of his lordship or his lieutenant-general; for the second offense, to forfeit ten pounds sterling, or in default of payment, to be publicly and severely whipped and imprisoned, as before directed; and for the third offense, to forfeit lands and goods, and be forever banished out of the province."

Such are two of the articles in this famous Catholic law, in favor of "*religious liberty*," forsooth! by which, we are gravely told by Dr. Hughes, that "the Catholics of Maryland have borne away the prize" from Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and all other competitors. Was ever falsehood more glaring? Was ever deception more complete?

The only redeeming feature in this famous Maryland law, is that a subsequent section declares that "any person presuming contrary to this act, willfully to disturb, wrong, trouble or molest any person whatsoever within this province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for, or in respect of his or her religion, or the free exercise thereof, otherwise"—mark the words!—"otherwise than is provided for in this act, shall pay treble damages to the party so wronged and molested, and also forfeit twenty shillings sterling for every such offense, one-half to his lordship, the other half to the party molested, and in default of paying the damage or fine, be punished by public whipping and imprisonment, at the pleasure of the lord proprietary."

The meaning of all which is—that Roman Catholics and all other professed Trinitarian sects might enjoy their opinions without molestation—a step in advance, it is admitted, of the practice of Romanists every where else—but that every Infidel, every Deist, every Unitarian, should be punished,

himself with death, and his family with starvation, by the confiscation of his goods to the lord proprietary.

And this, be it remembered, is the Catholic *beau ideal* of religious liberty, for which the orator of "the Catholic chapter" calls upon us to take the crown from the head of Roger Williams, or of William Penn, and place it upon the brow of the Catholic founder of Maryland.

When we contemplate the spectacle of three or four thousand people, sitting with open mouths, and listening with wondering and unquestioning credulity to these Jesuitical statements, we can scarcely wonder at the taunt of a foreign caricaturist, who represents the masses, in some sections of our country, as an assembly of eager dyspeptic patients, ranged side by side, with their heads thrown back, and their mouths wide open; while a quack doctor, with a huge basket of enormous pills, labeled "*humbug*," is passing in front of them—the patients, meanwhile, who have swallowed their share, patting their chests, and smiling with satisfaction, each one evidently enjoying his dose, just in proportion to the hugeness of the pill.

It is some relief, however, to the ludicrous picture, to know that three-fourths of the eager patients of Metropolitan Hall, were foreigners of the same faith and nation as the "most reverend" officiating *Doctor*. And if, perchance, among the other fourth, a sound old Knickerbocker, or a keen, "cute" Yankee, attracted by curiosity to hear something new, might be seen among the crowd;—the former would look on, with stern and grim visage, upon which was plainly written, "you can't deceive me, I know better;"—and the latter, with a smile of incredulity, would occasionally give a wink with his bright laughing eye, which seemed to whisper, "you don't say so!" But not a son of New York or New England could be cajoled or forced to open his mouth for a dose.

Having thus disposed—we trust to the satisfaction of the pope, cardinal and bishop—of this arrogant claim to the pioneer-championship of religious freedom in America, and we hope, settled the question, that this pretense is utterly groundless and absurd, it must be admitted, that on this western continent, Roger Williams remains the undisputed master of the field; sole possessor of the enviable title of pioneer-champion of religious freedom in America.

Broadly as this banyan tree of soul-liberty has now expanded its branches and fixed its roots over our fair and goodly land, the first seed was planted, when the hunted exile stepped from his canoe on to the soil of Rhode Island, the soil henceforth to be consecrated to liberty, and, as he says,



"in grateful remembrance of God's merciful providence to him in his distress," called it PROVIDENCE. Well may we apply to that spot the words of Mrs. Hemans' noble ode, and more truthfully, as we believe, than to any other spot on earth:

"O call it holy ground,  
The soil where first they trod,  
They have left unstained what there they found,  
FREEDOM TO WORSHIP GOD."

The doctrine of Roger Williams was, that liberty of conscience is every man's inalienable birthright and privilege, and that it is an execrable tyranny and a presumptuous interference with the prerogative of God himself, for any one man to coerce the conscience of another, whether that tyranny be exercised by pope or prelate, by priest, or president, or king. Not that man is irresponsible for his opinions or worship; but his responsibility is due to God alone, who is the sole lord of the conscience, and not to a fallible and erring mortal, a worm of the dust like himself. Such too, is the doctrine of Baptists, wherever they are found; and such would have long ago been the doctrine of the whole Protestant world, had not the reformation from popery been left incomplete. The early Protestants had too much to unlearn of the soul-enslaving doctrines of the false church they had renounced, to shake off in a lifetime, or even in a century or two, the persecuting dogma of Rome. Yet is Protestantism gradually, but surely, working out the problem of liberty; and the time is not distant when every man must renounce the last vestige of the persecuting creed, or abandon the name of Protestant.

Yet the world has lately been told by a gentleman who, for his dexterity in turning religious summersets, has won for himself the sobriquet of "the man of all denominations," and who just now professes to be a Roman Catholic, that "Protestantism is incompatible with liberty."\*

We are not about to reply to the versatile and protean lecturer. We do not think it necessary; and we do not believe, like the Roman Catholic, in works of supererogation. Instead, therefore, of insulting the intelligence of cultivated readers, by supposing that any such refutation is necessary, we will only suggest to Dr. Brownson (if, before the return of his annual lecturing harvest, he should not avow himself

---

\* The title of a lecture recently delivered in New York city, by Orestes A. Brownson, LL. D.

a Mohammedan or a Mormon,) to take as the theses for his next course of lectures, (1) The Inquisition an essential element of liberty. (2) The governments of Rome, Austria and Naples, the freest and happiest on earth. And (3) Sunshine incompatible with daylight.

*Risum tenete amici!* For you may rest assured that the wonderful genius who has demonstrated that Protestantism is incompatible with liberty, that Lord Bacon was an egregious sophist, and that the inductive philosophy is a cheat and a lie, is equally able to prove—and to make some people believe it too—that sunshine is incompatible with daylight, that the Inquisition is an essential element of liberty, and that Protestant America is the worst, but Catholic Austria, and Naples, and Rome, are the freest and happiest governments on earth.

With the history of this famous lecturer's mental idiosyncrasies before us, for the past few years, we are not surprised that the original of the portrait, drawn by the graphic, but caustic pen of one of our New England poets,\* was so speedily recognized.

“He's the Salt-river boatman, who always stands willing,  
To convey friend or foe, without charging a shilling;  
And so fond of the trip that, when leisure's to spare,  
He'll row himself up, if he can't get a fare.  
The worst of it is that his logic's so strong,  
That of two sides, he commonly chooses the wrong;  
If there is *only one*, why he'll split it in two,  
And first pommel *this* half, then *that* black and blue.”

Let us now proceed to examine further, the assertion of Mr. Bancroft, that Roger Williams was “the first in modern Christendom, to assert, in its plenitude, the doctrine of liberty of conscience,” and to assign to other great and honored names, the position which belongs to them in this noble struggle.

If the question of precedence could be settled by establishing the priority of “the Bloody Tenet” to Jeremy Taylor's “Liberty of Prophesying,” the task might be soon accomplished; for we presume that no one will deny, who has examined the subject, that the work of Williams was written in 1644, that of Taylor not till 1647. Had the excellent Bishop Heber possessed a more extensive acquaintance with ecclesiastical history beyond the pale of his own church, he

---

\* J. R. Lowell.

would never have asserted, as he has, in his life of Jeremy Taylor, that the "Liberty of Prophesying," is "*the first attempt on record* to conciliate the minds of Christians to the reception of a doctrine, which, though now the rule of action professed by all Christian sects, was then, by every sect alike, regarded as a perilous and portentous novelty." Instead of its being true that the book of Jeremy Taylor was "the first attempt on record" to establish the doctrine of religious liberty, Dr. Heber ought to have known that Roger Williams's preceded it by three years; and so far from liberty of conscience being then regarded by *every sect* as "a perilous and portentous novelty," that the Baptists had, as we shall show, been long before the year 1647, when this book was written, its consistent and unflinching advocates.

If, however, the work of Jeremy Taylor had been prior to that of Roger Williams, it could not have taken the palm from the latter, as a *defense of religious liberty*. With all its admitted excellencies, this is not the character of Dr. Taylor's book. All it pleads for is *toleration*, and that, only for those who can unite in the apostle's creed.

This is very far from the doctrine of soul-liberty, advocated by the Baptist champion, who claimed for all men entire liberty of conscience, as a right which God had bestowed, and of which no man could justly deprive another. To *tolerate* is simply to permit that which we have the right, if we choose, to forbid. He who has the power to tolerate, has the power to restrain. This right to tolerate, Roger Williams, and with him, the Baptists, as a body, deny. Religious liberty is a *right*, not a *favor*; and pope or prelate, monarch or magistrate, has no more authority from God, to deny this right to the humblest subject or layman, than the latter has to deny it to them.

The work of Jeremy Taylor, although it falls short of asserting in its plenitude, the doctrine of liberty of conscience, is yet one which deserves honorable mention, as a noble contribution to the literature of religious toleration, and tending, in no small degree, to abate the asperities of controversy; to show by the force of contrast, the unloveliness of the *odium theologicum* between rival sects; and to pave the way for the onward progress of the doctrine of entire religious liberty. The service done by this work to the cause we advocate, entitles it to grateful notice, and a brief glance at the contents of the volume will not, we hope, be uninteresting or unwelcome.

At the time Jeremy Taylor wrote it, he was himself a sufferer from the evils of intolerance. As he had enjoyed the



honor of being chaplain to the unfortunate Charles I., it was not surprising that he should share in the reverses of his royal patron. Driven by a decree of parliament from his rectory of Uppingham, he had sought a quiet retreat amidst the mountains and the glens of Wales; and he there employed his retirement and leisure upon a theme eminently congenial and appropriate. The result was, the production of this celebrated treatise upon "the Liberty of Prophesying," first published in the year 1647, some two years before the execution of the king.

The work was dedicated to Lord Hatton, and the commencement of the dedication is worthy of being quoted as an illustration of the sweet Christian spirit with which the author bore his reverses, mingled withal, though it be, with a spice of the pedantry or display, which was characteristic even of the most learned writers of his age. "In this great storm, which hath dashed the vessel of the church all in pieces, my lord," says Dr. Taylor, "I have been cast upon the coast of Wales, and in a little boat, thought to have enjoyed that rest and quietness, which in England, in a greater, I could not hope for. Here I cast anchor, and thinking to ride safely, the storm followed me with so impetuous violence, that it broke a cable, and I lost my anchor. And here again, I was exposed to the mercy of the sea, and the gentleness of an element, that could neither distinguish things nor persons; and but that He who stilleth the raging of the sea, and the noise of his waves, and the madness of his people, had provided a plank for me, I had been lost to all opportunities of content or study. But I know not whether I have been more preserved by the courtesies of my friends, or the gentleness and mercies of a noble enemy: *Οἱ γὰρ βάρβαροι παρείχον οὐ τὴν τυχούσαν φιλανθρωπίαν ἡμῖν, ἀνάψαντες γὰρ πυρὰν, προσελάβοντο πάντας ἡμᾶς, δια τὸν ὀρέον τον σφεσιῶτα, καὶ δια τὸ ψυχρός.* And now," he adds, "since I have come ashore, I have been gathering a few sticks to warm me, a few books to entertain my thoughts, and divert them from the perpetual meditation of my private troubles and the public dyscrasy."

In the eighteenth section of the work, Dr. Taylor argues, at some length, in favor of "liberty of prophesying" to those who deny infant baptism; and as arguments why Baptists should be tolerated, takes occasion to state the plausible reasons for their views, at such great length, and with so much point and force, as to give much trouble to his pedobaptist friends, to counteract the force of the Baptist arguments, and to furnish an excellent treatise in favor of Baptist views; so excellent, indeed, that this portion of Dr. Taylor's work, was,

some few years since, extracted from the volume by the Baptists of England, and published, as a powerful and effective treatise against infant baptism.\* Thus much may with truth be said, that, if Jeremy Taylor was not himself convinced of the force of these arguments, at the time he committed them to paper, he has furnished an illustration of fairness and candor, in his full and forcible statement of Baptist views, which constitutes a singular anomaly in the history of religious controversy.

It is a curious fact, that a well known parabolic story, which has often been reprinted, and for the last half-century generally ascribed to Benjamin Franklin, constitutes the closing paragraph of this celebrated work, first printed in 1647; "a strong proof," as is well observed by Hallam, "of the ignorance that long prevailed as to our earlier literature."† As the story is a beautiful illustration of the duty of Christian forbearance to mutual errors and faults, I will cite it, as it stands in the old folio edition of Bishop Taylor's work, from which I quote. "I end," says the author, "with a story which I find in the Jews' books. When Abraham sate at his tent door, according to his custome, waiting to entertain the strangers; he espied an old man stooping, and leaning on his staff, weary with age and travell, coming towards him, who was an hundred years of age. He received him kindly, washed his feet, provided supper, caused him to sit down; but observing that the old man eat and prayed not, nor begged for a blessing on his meat, he asked him why he did not worship the God of Heaven. The old man then told him that he worshipped the fire onely, and acknowledged no other God. At which answer, Abraham grew so zealously angry, that he thrust the old man out of his tent, and exposed him to all the evils of night, and unguarded condition. When the old man was gone, God called to Abraham, and asked him where the stranger was. He replied, I thrust him away because he did not worship thee. God answered him, I have suffered him these hundred years, although he dishonored me; and couldst not thou endure him one night, when he gave thee no trouble? Upon this, saith the story, Abraham fetcht him back again, and gave him hospitable entertainment and wise instruction. Go thou and do likewise, and thy charity will be rewarded by the God of Abraham."

---

\* The title of this treatise was as follows: "The Baptists justified, by Jeremy Taylor, D. D., late lord Bishop of Down and Connor, with an Introduction and notes, by Wm. Anderson. London, published by Rest Fenner, Paternoster Row, 1818."

† Introduction to the Literature of Europe, vol. ii., chap. 2, sec 61.

Cotemporary with Jeremy Taylor, and five years his senior, was England's illustrious poet, John Milton, who, in his belief of our two distinguishing tenets, liberty of conscience and believer's baptism, was himself a Baptist. In the year 1659, twelve years after the appearance of Dr. Taylor's work, and fifteen after that of Roger Williams, Milton gave to the world a noble treatise in favor of soul-liberty, entitled "Treatise of the civil power in ecclesiastical causes, showing that it is not lawful for any human power on earth to compel in matters of religion." The title of this work shows that its illustrious author was sound to the core upon the doctrine of religious liberty; and by this and his other eloquent writings upon the same subject, no less than by his bold, manly and spirit-stirring appeals, written, as the secretary of Cromwell, in classical Latin, on behalf of the persecuted and suffering Waldenses, has the great Milton won for his crown an equally imperishable chaplet, as the champion of freedom and protector of the oppressed, as that which adorns his brow, as the loftiest, the most gifted and sublime of the uninspired poets of the world.

A glance at the labors of some of the Baptist champions for soul-liberty, who preceded John Milton and Roger Williams, in the advocacy of this cause, a brief allusion to some of their cotemporaries, who suffered in its behalf, and a few thoughts suggested by the striking contrast between the present and the past, will be all that our limits will allow.

That Roger Williams was not "the first in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude the doctrine of freedom of conscience," would seem to be evident from the very fact that the arguments against persecution, prefixed to "the Bloody tenet" which called forth an answer to them from Mr. Cotton, and thus gave rise to Mr. Williams's more elaborate work, are entitled "Scriptures and reasons written long since, by a witness of Jesus Christ, close prisoner in Newgate, against persecution in cause of conscience."\* In another place, Williams relates the circumstance which probably suggested the name of his book. "The author of these arguments," says he, "not having in his prison the use of pen and ink, wrote them in milk, on sheets of paper, brought to him by a woman, his keeper, from a friend in London, as the stopples of his milk bottle," and afterward read by being held to the fire. The arguments against persecution, Mr. Williams says, and those in favor of it, were written in a marvelously different style and manner; the arguments

---

\* See the Bloody Tenet. Hansard Knollys edition, page 10.



against it in milk, the answer for it, as I may say, in blood.”\* And hence, the somewhat singular but characteristic name of his work—“The Bloody tenet of persecution for cause of conscience discussed.”

The arguments referred to are taken from the fuller work of the “prisoner in Newgate,” who was also a Baptist, first printed in 1620, twenty-four years before the work of Roger Williams, and was entitled “An humble supplication to the king’s Majesty, of many of the king’s most loyal subjects, who are persecuted only for differing in religion, contrary to divine and human testimonies.” It is subscribed—“your Majesty’s loyal subjects, not for fear only, but for conscience’ sake, unjustly called Anabaptists.” This work has lately been republished by the Hansard Knollys Society of England. It contains over forty pages, and is divided into ten chapters, the titles of which may be regarded as articles of the creed of those who signed and sent it. One of these articles says—“Kings are not deprived of any power given them from God, when they maintain freedom for cause of conscience.” Another states a truth which has since received its noblest demonstration in this free and happy land—“It is no prejudice to the commonwealth, if freedom of religion were suffered, but would make it flourish.” And another states that “Persecution for conscience is against the doctrine of Jesus Christ, the king of kings;” a truth which the Baptists of that early day were neither ashamed nor afraid to avow, as an article of their faith. The whole work is a calm, bold and manly statement of the rights of conscience, embodying most of the arguments which are expanded at length, in the more extensive treatise of Roger Williams.

Previous to the year 1644, in which the latter published his famous work, it is our belief that the Baptists stood alone, in modern Christendom, as the advocates of entire liberty of conscience.† The pioneer champions of soul-liberty in England, from whom Roger Williams doubtless imbibed his noble principles, were, we believe, all Baptists.

Ascending the stream of time, we notice in the year 1643, the appearance of another able Baptist treatise on the same subject, entitled—“Liberty of Conscience, or the sole means

---

\* See the Bloody Tenet. Hansard Knolly’s edition, page 36.

† See Underhill’s Biographical Introduction to the Bloody Tenet, page 34, Hansard Knollys edition. We are glad that the learned and able historical articles of Mr. Underhill have been collected into a volume and republished in this country, by Lewis Colby; and we can not too highly recommend the volume, entitled “Struggles and triumphs of Religious liberty,” with an introduction by Sewel S. Cutting.

to obtain peace and truth." Passing by the "Humble supplication," before referred to, which was published in 1620, and gave rise to the work of Mr. Williams; we come to one of the earliest and most important defenses of religious freedom on record, subscribed "by Christ's unworthy witnesses, commonly, but most falsely called Anabaptists." This work is generally known by the title of "Persecution for religion judged and condemned," and was published as early as 1615. The title on the original edition, however, which is exceedingly scarce, but of which two copies exist in the Bodleian library of Oxford, is as follows—"Objections answered by way of dialogue, wherein is proved by the law of God, by the law of our land, and by his Majesty's many testimonies, that no man ought to be persecuted for his religion, so he testify his allegiance by the oath appointed by law."\* The work is written, like that of Mr. Williams, in the form of a dialogue. A sentence or two may be given as a specimen of the soundness of the whole. Says the respondent in the dialogue, who represents the views of the writer—"I have faith to submit to what ordinance of man soever the king commands, if it be a human ordinance, and not against the manifest word of God. But MY SOUL, wherewith I am to worship God, that belongeth to another king, whose kingdom is not of this world." In another place he says—"If I defend the authority of Jesus Christ over men's souls, which appertaineth to no mortal man whatsoever, then know you that whosoever would rob HIM of that honor which is not of this world, he will tread them under foot. Earthly authority belongeth to earthly kings; but spiritual authority belongeth to that one spiritual king, who is KING OF KINGS." These noble avowals, be it remembered, were made and published by Baptists, five years before the first company of pilgrims sailed for the shores of New England, and nearly thirty before Roger Williams wrote his "Bloody tenet of persecution for cause of conscience discussed."

The only treatise which remains to be named, was written in 1614, by Leonard Busher, a Baptist; and, till an earlier one shall be produced, entitles its author to the palm, as *the pioneer-champion of liberty of conscience in modern Christendom*. It was entitled—"Religion's peace, or a plea for lib-

---

\* The edition of this early Baptist treatise in favor of liberty of conscience, was published in the year 1827, with a preface by our former venerated pastor, the Rev. Joseph Ivimey, author of the History of the English Baptists. We have often heard our old pastor speak of the work in the highest terms. It has also been recently published by the Hansard Knollys Society.

erty of conscience; wherein is contained certain reasons against persecution for religion; also a design for a peaceable reconciling of those that differ in opinion." This too, was a work that clearly stated the Baptist doctrine of liberty of conscience, pleaded most powerfully for the enjoyment of this right, and enforced the plea by some seventeen most cogent reasons against persecution for conscience' sake.

There can be scarcely a doubt that the future founder of religious freedom in America, in his early manhood, read some of these noble Baptist defenses of the rights of conscience, in his native land; and thus imbibed that ardent love for soul-liberty, on account of which, in subsequent life, he so bravely suffered, and which he succeeded in so firmly planting in his new settlement of Rhode Island, in the western world.

In reviewing the hasty glance which we have thus taken at some of the early champions of religious freedom, never let us forget that there is a debt of respect and gratitude due, not only from Baptists, but from the whole Christian world, to those honored pioneers in our denomination, for their noble struggle to secure that soul-liberty for their posterity, which we now so richly enjoy, but for which they contended, amidst persecution, and hatred, and contempt, more than two centuries ago.

Nor let us forget to render honor also to the martyrs who suffered, as well as to the champions who wrote in defense and maintenance of this glorious privilege. O, there is a debt of gratitude due from a world living in the enjoyment of religious liberty, to many a meek and humble Baptist sufferer for this cause; who, in the days of the persecuting Stuarts, in order to win for those who should come after them, freedom to worship God, were stoned out of the pulpit, or heavily fined, like the pious and learned Hansard Knollys, for no other offense, as he tells us, but preaching upon the text "Christ all and in all;" or stood in the pillory, like the meek but courageous Benjamin Keach, praising God for the honor of suffering for the name of Jesus, and rejoicing aloud that "the cross is the way to the crown;" or languished long years in a prison, like the almost inspired dreamer, John Bunyan, contending nobly, at every interview with his jailers or judges, for the right to believe, and to worship, and to preach, as God and duty enjoined; or laid themselves down to die in dungeons, like the excellent and gifted Thomas De-laune, who, after writing probably the ablest treatise on religious liberty that has ever appeared, was permitted, together with his wife and two children, all his family, to starve and



die in a prison, because he could not pay the oppressive fine that had been imposed on him by that Nero of the judicial bench, Judge Jeffries.

The very "Groans of Zion for her distressed" breathed forth from the depths of those dungeons, or reiterated in glowing and affecting remonstrances from the press,\* became powerful arguments for liberty of conscience, and rapidly hastened the triumph of the cause. The very songs, too, of Christ's suffering ones, sung, perhaps at midnight, like those of Paul and Silas, though echoed, at first, only by iron doors and bolts and bars, at length melted by their music and charmed by their melody the hard hearts of persecutors, and changed the lions to lambs; such songs for instance, as the quaint but expressive carols of Bunyan, with which he awoke the echoes and cheered the solitude of his prison-house at Bedford.

"Although men keep my outward man  
Within their bolts and bars,  
Yet by the faith of Christ, I can  
Mount higher than the stars.

Their fetters can not spirits tame,  
Nor tie up God from me,  
My faith and hope they can not lame,  
Above them I shall be.

The prison very sweet to me,  
Hath been since I came here,  
And so would also hanging be,  
If God will there appear."†

Privileged as we now are to sit under our own vine and fig-tree, in the full enjoyment of religious liberty, let us never forget the price at which that glorious boon was won; the remonstrances and pleadings, the watching and tears, the scourgings and imprisonment, and in some cases the martyrdom and death of these noble champions and sufferers for soul-liberty, who, though content, in their day to be looked upon as "the filth and the offscouring of all things," were yet "the excellent of the earth," noble benefactors of mankind, men "of whom the world was not worthy."

How wonderful the change which two centuries have pro-

---

\* In the year 1661, a treatise was written by Thomas Monck, a general Baptist minister, and published in England, entitled "Zion's Groans for her distressed, or Sober endeavours to prevent innocent blood."

† See "Prison Meditations," by John Bunyan, included in the volume of his "Experimental works," recently published by the American Baptist Publication Society.

duced in all Protestant Christendom, and especially on this western continent, both in theory and in practice, in relation to the rights of conscience; and how encouraging, how animating to every lover of freedom, is the contrast between the present and the past! Were it not that our limits forbid, we would cause to pass in review before us, a procession of humble but faithful Baptist sufferers for soul-liberty on this side of the Atlantic, who adorned the same age, and are worthy to share in the same honors as the fathers of our denomination in the parent country; worthy coadjutors and fellow-sufferers with Kiffin, and Knollys, and Gosnold, with Bunyan, and Jessy, and Keach, and Delaune. Instead of this, a single scene in the metropolis of New England, in the middle of the seventeenth century, contrasted with a far different scene just two centuries later, must suffice.

Let us roll back the dial of the world to the month of September, in the year 1651, and place ourselves in imagination, in one of the streets of old Boston town. See! there is a crowd passing along toward the place of public punishment and disgrace. In their midst is a man, bound and handled by the rude officers of the law as a criminal; but showing in his meek, upturned countenance, no tokens of guilt; and uttering with his lips the language of Christian exhortation and prayer. Who is he? what is his name? and what is the crime with which he is charged?

He is a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, a Baptist minister. His name is Obadiah Holmes, and his crime is that he has dared to preach the same gospel, and administer the same ordinances, as those which have been maintained on the same spot, by the venerated and beloved Stillman, and Baldwin, and Sharp, in succession, now for more than three-quarters of a century. But see! his clothes are rudely torn from his person by the coarse and brutal executioner, and this minister of Christ is tied securely to the whipping-post. Hark! he speaks. "Good people all, I am now about to be baptized in afflictions, that so I may have fellowship with my Lord; and am not ashamed of his sufferings, for by his stripes I am healed." His voice is silenced for a moment by the cruel thongs of "the three-corded whip," dashing the crimson gore from the quivering flesh of the man of God; and again he cries aloud—"though my flesh should fail, and my spirit should fail, yet God would not fail me!" "And so," to use the language of the meek sufferer, in relating this cruel scene to his brethren in England, "and so it pleased the Lord to come in, and to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I broke forth praying the Lord not to

lay this sin to their charge, and telling the people that now I found God did not fail me, and therefore I should trust him for ever. For, in truth, as the strokes fell upon me, I had such a spiritual manifestation of God's presence, as I never had before; and the outward pain was so removed from me that I could well bear it; yea, and in a manner, felt it not; although it was grievous, as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength, spitting in his hand three times, with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes."\*

A few days later, and that meek sufferer, bruised and wounded, so that for weeks he could rest only on his hands and knees, might have been seen stealthily threading his way through the forest-wilderness between Boston and Providence, to escape the constable, who with a second warrant, was hunting again for his prey; and as he drew near to the Rhode Island asylum of freedom, the voice of thanksgiving and songs of praise might have been heard "four miles in the woods," where pioneers of soul-liberty had gone to meet their suffering brother, to thank God for his deliverance, and to pour oil into his wounds.

It may serve as an index to the prevailing opinions, even in New England, two centuries ago, to mention that when this act of cruel persecution was severely rebuked in a letter from Sir Richard Saltonstall, in England, the Rev. John Cotton, author of the reply to Williams, entitled "the Bloody tenet washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb," boldly justified and defended the whipping of Holmes, and the right of the magistrate to persecute, by the flimsy sophism that "if the worship be lawful in itself, the magistrate compelling a man to it, compelleth him not to sin, but the sin is in the man's will that needs to be compelled;"† and at that time, not a minister in New England could be found, with the exception of the Baptists of Rhode Island, to dissent from the views of Mr. Cotton, or to speak a word in favor of freedom to worship God.

On the 28th of May, 1665, fourteen years after the scene of persecution we have described, Thomas Gould, a member of a Pedobaptist church in Charlestown, Richard Goodall, a member of the Baptist church in London, of which Mr. Kiffin was then pastor, and seven other humble disciples, after

---

\* These expressions are quoted from a letter of Mr. Holmes, addressed "unto the well-beloved John Spilesbury, William Kiffin, and to the rest that in London stand fast in the faith." See the principal part of this letter quoted in Ivimey's *History of the Baptists*, vol. i., page 208-211. Also in *Benedict's History*, page 376.

† Ivimey, vol. i., page 215. *Benedict*, page 378.



wading through a sea of persecution, formed themselves into the first Baptist church of Boston. Fifteen years later, on the 8th of March, 1680, the doors of their humble sanctuary were nailed up by the marshal, and a notice posted thereon, warning "all persons" against holding any meetings, or opening the doors, "as they will answer the contrary at their peril." And the little despised band were compelled to meet to worship God under a temporary covering in the yard of their meeting-house.

But soon, a brighter day begins to dawn. Every experiment has only proved the utter folly of attempting to control the conscience by coercive means. The sun of soul-liberty, shining so brightly over the neighboring colony of Rhode Island, sends its rays beyond the limits of the noble little state; and at length, light bursts into the minds of the ministers of Boston, and they begin to look with a more favorable eye upon the little company of Baptists in their midst, who have so long and so nobly struggled for "freedom to worship God."\* The march of freedom is onward, still onward. Not all at once, but by sure, though gradual steps, and not one step backward, till at length the New England mind becomes emancipated, freedom of conscience is declared the right of all, and the doctrine of Roger Williams is at last triumphant. At the present time, throughout all New England, and in all the United States, equality of civil and religious privileges is conceded to every sect, with a single obsolete exception in the statute book of New Hampshire, which the intelligence of the people of the Granite State, we are sure, will soon erase.

One more scene in this panorama of the champions and the triumphs of soul-liberty, and we have done. It is the 8th day of January, in the year 1852. Just two hundred years and four months have passed away since the whipping of the Baptist minister Holmes. A vast assembly have convened in one of the most venerable and stately church edifices of the New England metropolis. Among that assembly are the flower of New England's true nobility, not the empty title, but of intellect and heart. The honored chief magistrate of the commonwealth is there, and a long train of "grave and reverend" senators, and legislators, and judges, and divines,

---

\* As a proof of this fact, it may be mentioned, that at the ordination of the Rev. Elisha Callendar, as pastor of the first Baptist church in Boston, which took place May 21st, 1718, the Rev. Increase Mather, Cotton Mather, and John Webb, the principal Congregational pastors of Boston, participated in the services of the occasion; and that, too, in the very house that had, thirty-eight years previously, been nailed up by the authorities of the town. Benedict, 389.

the ornaments of the workshop, the farm, or the counting-house, the bar, the bench, or the pulpit. They have met to listen to lessons of instruction from the minister of God, on the occasion of their annual election sermon, and to implore wisdom from on high to qualify them for the duties to which they have been chosen.

And who is that servant of Christ, who by their own appointment, rises before them, and announces as his theme, "RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, such as is enjoyed in these United States, derived directly from the king of heaven; not regarded as a matter of toleration, but a heaven-descended and inalienable right?"\* Who is he? He is simply a humble minister of Christ, a Baptist minister, occupying only the platform of equality with his brother ministers of other sects; a position which was just as much the right of his brethren in the faith and in the ministry, Williams and Holmes, two hundred years ago, as it is the right of himself; a minister who has long preached the very same truths, for declaring which, his brother Baptist ministers, two centuries before, had been so shamefully scourged at the whipping-post, almost on the very spot where that preacher stands. Who is he? He is the pastor of that self-same first Baptist church of Boston, whose persecuted members were shut out of their humble sanctuary, when its doors were nailed up by the marshal, one hundred and seventy-two years before; a successor, moreover, to the principles of Roger Williams, cherishing as dearly as that noble champion, the blessing of soul-liberty; but instead of being driven, like him, from the abodes of civilized men, to seek in the wilderness, a home for liberty of conscience, standing up in the great assembly of honorable men, to defend the same glorious principle for which Williams became a sufferer, a fugitive, and an exile; while now, and in that assembly, every countenance beams with a smile of approval, and every heart does homage to the truth.

While we contemplate the wonderful contrast between the Boston scenes of 1651 and 1680, which we have described, on the one hand, and the far different scene of 1852, on the other; well may we exclaim, in the words of the Latin adage,

*"Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis."*

Or, in the paraphrase of the words given by an English poet,

---

\* See Rev. Dr. Neale's Election Sermon on Religious Liberty, page 8. Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, State Printers, 1852.

"Men change with fortune, manners change with climes,  
Tenets with books, and principles with times."

Yet amidst all these changes which time has produced in the tenets or principles of others, it may well be the glory of our denomination, that Baptists have continued steadily true to their mission, as witnesses for soul-liberty. On this subject, their principles have varied neither with "climes" nor "times;" but alike in adversity and in prosperity, in evil report and good report, in the beginning of the seventeenth century as in the middle of the nineteenth, in the old world as well as in the new, they have persevered, as the firm, unflinching, undeviating advocates for perfect liberty of conscience to all the family of man. Thank God! we have lived to see this glorious principle triumphant in America. May our children live to see it triumphant throughout the world!

Enjoying as we do the precious fruit which has sprung from the seed sown in tears, by the champions and sufferers for soul-liberty, who have passed rapidly in review before us, we ask, does not the world owe them—do not we owe them a debt of gratitude, and veneration, and love: a debt which we may best acknowledge, if we can never cancel, by standing true to the principles for which they toiled and suffered; and by diffusing those principles through every land, till the crushed and bound victims of Pagan caste, and of Moham-medan delusion, and of Popish soul-slavery, shall rise up in the dignity of men, shake off the fetters that bind them, and become the Lord's freemen; and till the glorious blessing of religious liberty, and Christian truth, so dearly won, and so richly enjoyed in free, enlightened, Protestant America, shall be extended through every land, and enjoyed by the whole family of man?

---



ART. III.—A FEW THOUGHTS ON SELF-EDUCATION.

BY REV. JOHN J. BRANTLEY, NEWBERRY, S. C.

IN the earlier years of life, others are, in a good degree, responsible for us. Our parents, our teachers, and others who properly exercise authority over us, are then charged with the care of our education. They are our guides and monitors; to them belong the oversight of our actions, and the management of our entire life. But when we arrive at mature age, and pass from under the control of parents and instructors, we become mainly responsible for ourselves. From that time, we begin to form our own characters; to modify our own moral and intellectual natures; to mould our own destinies, and to work out for ourselves, the grand problem of being. We then become the censors and judges of ourselves, and begin to sustain the weighty functions of self-control, self-instruction, and admonition. To all who acquit themselves well of such a charge, will be honor and happiness; to all who abuse it by neglect or desertion, will be shame and wretchedness. Obviously, the most important inquiry to those whose character and destiny are thus depending on themselves, is by what means they may best discharge this responsibility, and secure to themselves the greatest amount of honor and happiness. The reflections which follow are designed to form, in some sort, an answer to such an inquiry.

The first object to be regarded in the process of self-education, is *to watch over the impressions and associations already received, with the view of securing the mind against the influence of prevailing errors, and of engaging its prepossessions on the side of truth.* Truth and error are singularly related to each other. Every error is a departure from the truth, and hence truth is properly the point at which error begins. We are, then, liable to error in the pursuit of truth. Its direct and onward path is perpetually crossed by the devious and often inviting ways of error. These ways often present a variety of objects, which, for the time at least, are apt to draw us off by their fascinations. They flatter our pride, stimulate morbid curiosity, encourage the spirit of random speculation, and hold out deceptive promises of distinction and felicity. At the same time there is an unavoidable

severity in the path of truth. The flowers which grow beside it, are nurtured by trying elements, and cherished into unpretending loveliness. The streams which blend their music along this path, though transparent and beautiful, are not the dashing torrents which captivate those who are wandering in the ways of error, but soft and gentle, delighting us by their placid course. Almost at the moment of our diverging from the walks of truth, we meet a new class of travelers. They are theorists, false reasoners, angry disputants, daring propounders of novelties, or sullen bigots in the defense of antiquated absurdities. They are often the teachers of disorganizing doctrines, or the assertors of blasphemous views, or profane wranglers against the most sacred and venerable principles. The men of truth do not present this diversity of character. They are one brotherhood. Their charities never fail; though separated from each other by many circumstantial differences, they have one common creed—the love of truth—one common tendency toward that final victory, which truth is destined to achieve over error. All who would train themselves to habits of rectitude and virtue; who desire to deepen and give permanence to the good impressions received through the discipline of earlier years, and who are anxious to avoid the errors with which the path of life abounds, must attach themselves to the society of the men of truth. In the company of the wise and good, we shall be most favorably situated for the preservation and development of the impressions which truth and virtue have already made upon us, and shall find the best security against insidious errors.

In training ourselves to the pursuit of truth and virtue, care must be taken to keep the passions under due control. The passions though an admirable and necessary part of our nature when held in proper subordination, are most baleful in their effects when permitted to usurp the office of guides. It should be remembered that some of them are perpetually aiming at the mastery; that they commonly invest their objects with a false light; that they are apt to pervert the judgment, and hurry us into rash measures. In a word, Truth has no greater adversaries than unbridled passions. The opinions and conduct of the wisest men are to be distrusted, when passion is detected behind the curtain. In educating ourselves, therefore, to habits of wisdom and goodness, to all the honorable accomplishments of public and private life, as well as the sanctities of religion, we must place the curb of wholesome restraint upon our passions. Let them loose, and they drive furiously into confusion, agitate the settled order

of society, overturn its foundations, and ruin the cherished institutions of wise legislation and sound morality. He who subdues his passions, gains a victory deserving laurels. No blood stains such a victory; no ruined cities, no desolated countries, no fields of carnage are its trophies; but a fallen and corrupt nature raised, purified and adorned, is its far nobler result.

*The due cultivation of all the powers of our nature, so as to bring the mind to the greatest harmony and perfection of which it is capable, is a care which falls properly within the province of self-education.* Our particular pursuits in life, whatever they are, give exercise and employment to certain of our powers; but should other powers be left without exercise, they must of course, become impaired by disease, and fall into decay. We do not expect to find the highest perfection of physical vigor in persons who exercise only a part of the members of their bodies, but in those who find constant and appropriate employment for the whole. The mind, in like manner, requires action in every power; frequency and variety of exercise alone can render it healthy and vigorous. A degree of cultivation in every department of knowledge, is the most effectual means of attaining distinguished excellence in any one. Disinclination, or even inaptitude toward a particular study, constitutes a reason for directing attention to that study, because it may so happen that such study is the very one which is to impart new strength and vivacity to the mental powers. At all events, it would seem requisite to bring up the various faculties to a just equipoise. When it is recollected that all the branches of knowledge stand in the most intimate connexion with each other, and are bound together by mutual influences and dependencies, it must become evident that the general student will possess advantages, even in a particular pursuit, far superior to those which result from a limited application to one pursuit, to the exclusion of all others. It might be supposed, for instance, that the study of Latin and Greek, and the other branches of knowledge comprised in a liberal course of education, is of little or no consequence to persons destined for mercantile or mechanical pursuits. But though an opportunity may seldom occur in such pursuits, for a direct application of the bare knowledge acquired in the course of a liberal education, yet there will always be opportunities for displaying the mental vigor and discipline which it has imparted. A course of liberal study has a tendency to strengthen and stimulate the reasoning faculty, to elevate and refine the feelings; in a word, to give force, consistency and eleva-



tion to the entire intellectual and moral nature. And since he is best prepared to rise to honorable distinction, and to find success in the various pursuits of life, who has the most comprehensive views, the widest extent of knowledge, and the best trained judgment, as well as the most liberal and honorable sentiments, it follows that the most liberally and thoroughly educated man, to say the least, will possess more advantages and be better prepared to rise to distinction as a merchant or mechanic, than he who has been educated exclusively with a view of such pursuits. To the impression that it is not necessary or even desirable for a man to be thoroughly educated in order to engage in commercial or mechanical business, is to be attributed much of that disinclination which is felt by educated men to engage in such business. It is unjustly depreciated by being thus disconnected from intellectual pursuits. It is time that such an opinion was exploded, and that the impression should every where prevail that those who are devoted to such avocations, can not be too liberally and systematically educated.

*As our success in life depends chiefly upon the nature of our habits, a very important part of self-education relates to the formation of good habits.* The power of habit seems to have been given us, that we might be enabled to form ourselves after the best models, and to establish the best characters. In this view, it is a kind arrangement of Providence. If we accustom our minds to an erect position, habit will render that position easy; if we acquire the habit of denying the solicitations of evil, the pain of self-denial is changed into a pleasure. If we accustom ourselves to the exercise of sympathy, humanity and benevolence, all the difficulties which sometimes impede the operation of these affections, become easy and delightful. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten, that by the constant habit of stooping, the mind as well as the body, loses its erectness, and yields insensibly to degradation. We are constantly solicited to error in the formation of our habits, and this, partly, because the actions on which the best habits depend, are at first either positively disagreeable, or else agreeable only in a moderate degree. But the actions which produce vicious habits, are too frequently most agreeable to the natural bent of the mind. Unless we guard ourselves by a discreet circumspection, we glide almost imperceptibly into trains of thought which win, at last, undisputed possession of the heart. How lamentable the condition of that human being who thus becomes the slave of debasing associations. He lies at the mercy of circumstances; he feels himself dragged down to perdition

by an inevitable law. Having once given itself up to the tyranny of depraved thoughts, the mind, prolific of mischief, goes on in the work of degeneration. It is necessary, then, to begin the formation of right habits, with a due regard to the laws of mental association, by asserting and maintaining our power over the trains of our ideas. Great is the power of thought. All the elementary principles of moral conduct may be found in the thoughts. They are the seeds of actions, the faint outlines of good or evil, the ground-work of the whole picture of human life. The entire current of morality flows from these little fountains which rise unobserved in the secret recesses of the mind. Here crime and misery begin. Indeed, a moral agent *thinks* himself either into virtue or vice, into happiness or misery.

Such being the power of thought, it becomes all to guard well their mental moods. In a certain sense, we have no absolute power over this part of our intellectual nature. We are not able by any effort, to suspend entirely, the current of perception and thought. We have no power to produce a state of mental inaction. The mind is essentially active. It can not remain still and do nothing. We must continue to feel, to perceive, to think, in spite of ourselves. The only power which we possess is the power of breaking the continuity of our mental operations, of interrupting the trains of our ideas. Though we are not able to exclude thought from the mind, we are able to change its direction, to vary its character, and to employ it about what objects we please. This is all the power we have, but this is amply sufficient; and in the right management of it, our happiness and moral dignity depend. Our thoughts have their character varied, by the character of the objects about which they are employed. They resemble a vein of water passing over various mineral strata: it gushes out with some mineral impregnations. So our thoughts partake of the nature of the things with which they are conversant. When these are evil, our thoughts will be evil; when they are pure, so will our thoughts be pure. A mind which is continually filled with low and groveling images, which finds its habitual employment amid the scenes and objects of sensuality and vice, will necessarily contract the defilement which belongs to its objects. On the other hand, the mind which finds its most habitual and delightful employment in thinking on "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report," will be insensibly assimilated in its nature, to the nature of the things which it contemplates. If we would form our-

selves, therefore, to virtue and honor, it must be our care to give a right direction to our thoughts, and to engage them about such objects only, as are approved by the sanction of truth and virtue.

The thoughts naturally have free scope, and therefore are easily tempted astray. If allowed too much latitude, they become wayward and *wandering*. When they assume this character, they are often bad, irrespectively of the objects about which they are employed, because their tendency is to enfeeble the mind. This has a tendency to give the imagination undue prominence among the mental powers, to lower the understanding, and to disqualify us for meeting with ease and propriety, the realities of life. Abandoned to pursue without restraint, whatever direction caprice or accident may give to them, the thoughts contract a *habit* of vagrancy; serious pursuits become irksome; the mind grows light and volatile, and abandons itself to the pursuit of vanity. To avoid such a result, it should be the aim of all who would form elevated characters, to exercise constant vigilance over their thoughts. They should be restrained from wandering, and the only way to do this, is to give them sufficient and appropriate employment at home; to keep them always busy under the supervision of the judgment.

*Intimately connected with the management of the thoughts, is the acquisition of an early command over our moral associations.* On the exercise of this command depend the most important differences in the characters of individuals. It is true that there are constitutional diversities in the original elements of our nature, and it is impossible that any system of education can equalize the gradations of mind. It is no less true that discipline and training ordinarily produce a much greater approximation toward equality, than is generally imagined. The agreeable and instructive poet, the eloquent orator, and even the man of wit, are indebted for their success to the command which they acquire, not only over their mental, but their moral associations. The laborious and successful researches conducted by the student in the abstract and exact sciences, the readiness of invention possessed by some in a degree so much higher than others, are events attributable to the command acquired over the associative faculty. But throughout the whole province of morality and ethics, the exercise of power over the laws of association is indispensable to rectitude and happiness. Take this away, and you subject man to a debasing servitude. You leave him to be tossed to and fro, the sport of capricious emotions; you make him the mere creature of circumstan-



ces ; you pluck from his head the crown of glory, and leave him sunk in the slavery of sense. The only certain method to shun this descent, is to make ourselves *masters of ourselves* and of the circumstances with which we may be surrounded. Let it not be supposed that such a dominion is an impossible achievement. It is difficult, but not impossible. Through the blessing of God, it has been achieved by thousands, and is still in progress of achievement by thousands more. And those who have gained it, are the true "salt of the earth," whose wholesome virtues pervade the whole mass of society, exerting a healing influence upon its infirmities, and preserving it from corruption and decay.

In making all the great moral distinctions, upon which the conduct of life should proceed, we have two great and faithful guides, *Reason* and the *Bible*. These two are placed together, because they admirably harmonize and reflect light upon each other. Our duty to ourselves, our obligations to society and to God, are all matters which may be reasoned upon, and made the subjects of fair and legitimate deduction. We determine that certain actions are right, and others wrong, precisely in accordance with the same laws of reasoning as those by which we determine the agreement or disagreement of any two terms in science. Morality and immorality then, are no longer things of taste or questions of feeling, but realities to which the test of enlightened Reason is to be applied. This is the great detector of moral distinctions. Is it pleasure we pursue? Let us pause and ask whether it be something which can stand approved by the sanction of Reason. Does it enlarge the mind? Does it elevate and humanize the heart? Does it correspond with all the social relations? Then we have an undeniable right to pursue it, and a well sustained confidence in the propriety of our actions. On the other hand, pleasures and amusements that are incompatible with humanity, that abase the dignity of moral agents, that narrow down the range of intellect and end in the gratification of the inferior senses, are as contrary to the principles of sound ethics, as they are to general happiness. Is it business we pursue with the design of gain or livelihood? Is the same business as lawful for any other member of the community as for us? Does it minister to the stability and welfare of society at large? Does it include within its aims and bearings, the advantage and comfort of others, as well as our own? Then, and not till then, is it a lawful business. There is reason, however, to fear that the morality of business is little understood and less practiced, and that the arts of sophistry have insinuated themselves

into the matter-of-fact transactions of common life. Men of enlightened and well trained minds, should unite to oppose these sinister arts.

The most important influence which we exert upon ourselves, relates to that state of being which is to succeed the present. The aid of Religion must be called in as a necessary support to the mind, under the pressure of those weighty concerns with which it is charged. The soul without God, is without protection, without a home or a resting place. In such a state it is the prey of discontent and doubt, of remorse and despair. Abandoned to its own resources, it turns its consuming passions on itself. Science denies it any satisfaction; nature seals up her volume of instruction and beauty, and presents only a dark unmeaning record; hope fades into gloom, and the generous thirst for glory and immortality, becomes an incurable fever that "drinks up all its bliss." On the other hand, the soul that gives in its adhesion to the Almighty Maker, reveres his authority, adores his infinite perfections, and invokes his compassion through the great Mediator, rises in the scale of being. The very powers of the understanding in such a one, are molded into better habits, and strengthened with new vigor. Emerging from the darkness of unbelief, he sees a new world, new heavens and a new earth; standing upon the analogies of nature, he is sufficiently elevated to perceive the wonderful truths and adaptations of Christianity to the nature and wants of man, while by the light of Revelation he explores and comprehends the mysteries of Nature. He traces back the origin of all things to the mandate of the Creator, when

"Confusion heard his voice, and wild uproar  
Stood ruled, stood vast infinitude confined."

He looks forward to the consummation of all things, and contemplates the ultimate victory of justice, truth and love, over all the elements of discord and destruction.

---

ART. IV.—THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH.

*The Eclipse of Faith, or a Visit to a Religious Sceptic.* Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1852.

THIS is a republication of a work which has recently appeared in England, anonymously, but supposed to be from the pen of Mr. Henry Rogers, whose able and eloquent contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*, have attracted considerable attention. This supposition, we presume, has arisen from an apparent coincidence of sentiment between this work and an elaborate article on "Reason and Faith," by Mr. Rogers, which appeared, something more than a year ago, in the *Edinburgh Review*. Except this, there is no decisive evidence that the supposition is correct. The style of the two productions is not altogether alike, though this is often a poor criterion in such cases, the compositions of the same author, as in the case of Fichte, frequently varying with his subject and mood of mind. At times, indeed, one imagines he sees the same features and gait, but he soon begins to doubt; for the work before us has a freedom, energy and playful wit, combined with a tone of powerful sarcasm, which we have not discovered in the productions of Mr. Rogers. Still he may have been roused to extraordinary effort, and for the purpose of effect have indulged his wit and satire "beyond his wont." This, however, is a matter of no consequence, as we have to do with the book more than with its author.

Evidently it has disturbed the equanimity of the Westminster Reviewer, who speaks of it as "a clumsy attempt to work such stiff material as Butler's 'Analogy,' into the form and fashion of a theological fiction. Essays and epistles," he adds, "dialogues and dreams, are jumbled together in the most chaotic confusion that fact or fiction ever fell into." Not content with pronouncing, *ex cathedra*, this severe judgment, the reviewer kindles into wrath, and summarily dismisses the book, in the following contemptuous style: "The author is one of those narrow-brained men who have sufficient logical dexterity to draw sound conclusions, provided they had sufficient intuitive power to know when they have started from right data. Vain jangling, religious sterility, the want of moral purpose and of controversial courtesy, are the chief characteristics of his work."



A fair specimen this of one-sided, ungenerous reviewing, but not unworthy of the modern illuminati who control the Westminster. Rejecting, as most of them do, all logic and argument, as useless in the domain of religion, and worshipping their absolute intuition as the only rule of faith, these sapient spiritualists are incapable of appreciating a free, energetic and manly work like the *Eclipse of Faith*.<sup>\*</sup> The fact is, the pill was hard to swallow, and we question whether they did more than simply taste its quality. No candid man, of whatever opinion, could have read the work through, without acknowledging its extraordinary ability. He might find some fault with the plan and style; he might believe that the author had pressed his points too far, or had been too severe upon a fallen foe; but he would have conceded to him ability and energy, great power of argument, and a surprising command of wit, satire and illustration. He would have given him credit also for dignity and sincerity, as well as a profound appreciation of the beauty and perfection of the Christian faith.

This, however, was hardly to be expected from the conductors of the Westminster, who would rather praise Andrew Jackson Davis and the clairvoyants, than an able, earnest defender of historical Christianity.<sup>†</sup> The fact is, our modern spiritualists are, of all men, the most unfair and dogmatic. They can see neither learning nor genius, beyond the sphere of their own little coterie. The *ipse dixit* of Strauss, or of Carlyle, is frequently of more authority with them, than all the facts of history, and all the learning of the schools. Not without some erudition and talent themselves, they are befooled by an intolerable contempt of their neighbors. They can see nothing in historical Christianity but figments. Its defenders they treat as bigots or dupes. They actually imagine that the whole fabric of our common faith is tottering to its fall, under the arrows of their critical Lilliput!

*The Eclipse of Faith* is not without defects. Some will object to its plan, which is novel, and perhaps somewhat heterogeneous; others may not quite relish its style, so vigorous and free, and withal dashed with an occasional touch of

---

<sup>\*</sup> Great diversity of opinion exists among the contributors to the Westminster. Some of them believe in logic, and cling to the empirical modes of Bentham and his school; others, we should think, are downright materialists; though the majority, probably, are spiritualists of the Newman and Parker school. The editor, however, is a dry logician, of considerable acuteness and vigor.

<sup>†</sup> Several favorable notices of Andrew Jackson Davis, the prophet of Mesmerism and spirit-rappings, have appeared in the Westminster.

rusticity and homeliness. Some expressions may appear wanting in dignity, though these fit well enough into the general composition, which is sometimes highly polished and even ornate. For ourselves we must confess that we have rarely read a book with greater relish. It cuts up root and branch, the bold and infidel spiritualism of Parker, Newman, Gregg, *et id genus omne*. Some of the positions taken may not be tenable; others perhaps are pressed too far; but the work as a whole is a lively and successful attack upon the ranks of modern skepticism.

The argument employed is the *reductio ad absurdum*. The plan, like that in the works of Plato, is chiefly dialectical. The writer throws in occasionally a letter to a friend, a dream, a dissertation, or some personal experience, with other quite amusing and instructive episodes, such as "the skeptics' select party," and "the paradise of fools." Yet the book, to our mind, is orderly enough, and the aim definite and clear. It is not offered as a complete defense or exposition of Christianity, nor does it touch many interesting and important questions connected with the subjects which it discusses; but it accomplishes its design, namely to reduce to absurdity the crude pretensions and extravagant theories of infidel spiritualists. Our fellow-citizen Theodore Parker and Mr. Newman, of England, brother of the celebrated pervert to Popery, and author of "The Soul, its Sorrows and Aspirations," and "The Phases of Faith," in which he has minutely described his easy descent into error, receive, as they deserve, a vigorous castigation. Not that our author assails them personally; far from it; though the Westminster Review would intimate something of this kind. It is only their errors which he shows to be absurd and dangerous.

We are quite aware that a frank, earnest book, which deals vigorous blows upon some cherished error, will always be stigmatized by those who suffer from it, as narrow and bigoted; but this is nothing. While pitying errorists, and treating them with all personal courtesy, no quarter ought to be given to their assumptions. The sooner a mad dog is dispatched the better, even if he belong to some worthy neighbor, who can not be convinced that there is any thing the matter with his favorite. The first man that shoots the dangerous creature, deserves the thanks of all good citizens. To be sure, it is not a very genteel or pleasant operation, but it is marvelously useful. If then, our common Christianity is attacked by speculative error, run mad, let us not hesitate to extinguish it, even if some foolish sentimentalists should

cry out against our severity. The fact is, if we do not destroy it, it will soon destroy us.

Apart, indeed, from their strange errors, we cherish a certain sympathy for such men as Theodore Parker and Mr. Newman. They possess some gifts and graces. Both of them write with a certain beauty and energy of style. Their minds perhaps, have, unconsciously to themselves, been warped from the truth. It may be, that they have never known it, in its regenerating power. They have never, perhaps, seen the Saviour, with the eye of a living faith. Who knows but some strange weakness of judgment or perversion of feeling taints their noble powers, and obscures to their vision, the truth as it is in Jesus. It is certain also, as St. Augustine finely suggests, that in all error there are certain portions of truth. Light and darkness are strangely mingled in the minds of men. "*Nulla falsa doctrina est quae non aliquid veri permesceat.*" (Quaest. Evang. i. 2, c. 40.) Hence both Mr. Parker and Mr. Newman speak eloquently of the necessity of Religion, the beauty and perfection of the Holy Scriptures, even when marred and mutilated by their skeptical criticism, the depth and grandeur of the soul, its essential relations to God, and the serenity and joy of a good man's heart. Here we sympathize with them, and in view of their mournful aberrations, could weep tears of bitterest regret. But what are they doing? Denying the inspiration and the authority of God's Word, the truth of miracles, the reality of supernatural religion, the resurrection and ascension of the Son of God! In a word, they are making the most vigorous efforts, as we view it, to blot the Sun of righteousness from the central heaven.

Are we become their enemy, then, because we tell them the truth? And are we to be charged with bigotry and discourtesy because we designate their errors as infidel and destructive? We could not be honest men if we did otherwise. The author of *The Eclipse of Faith*, would be unworthy, not only of our respect, but of theirs, had he done otherwise. We thank him for his honesty and energy; and should he write another book on the same subject, we trust he will deal yet heavier blows against the insidious skepticism of the times.

The chief interlocutors in the work before us are Mr. Harrington, a gifted and amiable skeptic, whose early faith, the fruit of maternal affection, has suffered a sad *eclipse*, his uncle, the writer, and Mr. Fellowes, a member of the spiritual school. Harrington is by no means a common or vulgar doubter, but profound, candid, mournful. He sees no *via*



*media* between divine revelation and absolute doubt. Still, he "doubts even his doubts," and only contemns the dogmatism of the infidel intuitionists, who reject all historical revelation, including Christianity; and attempt to weave what they term a system of absolute religion, in their view, the only real and vital religion, from their own convictions. They call it absolute, because it is based upon absolute and universal intuitions; though they find it hard work to agree as to the nature and scope of these intuitions; some, as Mr. Newman, confining them chiefly to the idea of God, or the relation of the soul of man to the infinite; for he does not find the immortality of the soul among his absolute convictions; and others, like Parker, making it to consist chiefly in the idea of God, and the immortality of the soul, with the duties thence resulting. Most of them deny, though some of them admit the possibility of miracles. Some reject one part of the Bible, some another. Mostly, they agree in rejecting the value and even possibility of "a book revelation," and yet they are constantly communicating their own revelations and lucubrations by means of books and pamphlets. Great philosophers, you see, who can do what God himself can not do! This sort of dogmatism Harrington holds in utter contempt, as shallow and unphilosophical; and he gives good reasons for his contempt. Perhaps he pushes the thing occasionally a little too far, but allowance must be made for his mood of mind, so mournful to himself, so instructive to others. He, at least, is open to conviction; while the spiritualists, good, easy souls, imagine themselves the confidants of the Deity, and thence familiar with the secrets and possibilities of universal thought.

Harrington proves conclusively that the principles of historical criticism applied by Strauss, Parker and others, to the Gospels, would destroy all history; that their objections to the supernatural or miraculous element of Christianity, founded upon the assumed impossibility of such divine interposition, would extinguish our belief in the great fact or miracle of the first creation, and lead to pantheism, if not to atheism. We have rarely seen the subject of miracles discussed with more clearness and force.

On one occasion Harrington gathers together a number of skeptics into a select party, and sets them to discussing their favorite dogmas, with a most edifying confusion, thus showing that, even on fundamental points, they contradict and confute each other. This portion of the work reminds us of a task to which we set ourselves some time since, namely to collect as many definitions of religion as possible from the

works of those who deny or modify historical Christianity. Our readers will be amused, if not edified, by a few specimens. Theodore Parker starts very well, defining religion to be *voluntary obedience to the law of God*; but not satisfied with this, he goes on, with a striking vagueness, to explain it as *inward and outward obedience to that law he has written on our nature, revealed in various ways through instinct, reason, conscience, and the religious sentiment*.<sup>\*</sup> We like Plato's definition vastly better than this, as it is simple and clear; for he speaks of it as *likeness to God according to our capacity*. Henry James, more transcendental than Parker, maintaining "the doctrine of the divine natural man," or "the God-endowed and God-freighted man," would define it to be the recognition of "the infinite and the divine in every man," no matter if a Cain or a Robespierre. After this, we need not wonder that he finds "a profound humanitarian significance in drunkenness."<sup>†</sup> Others define religion to be "the tendency of the human mind to the infinite;" "a feeling of the infinite;" "the innermost point of human consciousness;" "the fluidity of the soul tending to the infinite;" "the recognition of a subjective divinity;" "the harmony of the subjective with the objective;" "the correspondence of the finite concrete to the infinite abstract;" "the adjustment of the contingent to the absolute;" "immediate self-consciousness of the absolute dependence of all the finite on the infinite;" "faith in a moral government of the world;" "the union of the finite and the infinite;" "morality becoming conscious of the free universality of its concrete essence;" or as Parker explains the expression, "perfect mind becoming conscious of itself." The last four are the definitions of Schleiermacher, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel. Auguste Comte, who does not pretend even to be a Deist, in his "Système de Politique Positive," has outstripped them all, by defining religion "not as this or that creed, but as the *tout ensemble*, or harmony, proper to human existence, individual and collective, constituting for the soul a normal *consensus*, similar to that of health for the body." There, if any body can go beyond that, they are welcome to try.

But to return to the work before us, we are bound to say that with all its excellences, it has two defects. One is, that it does not place in as clear light as it ought, the fundamental principles of reason and conscience, upon which all religion must be finally based, and on the ground of which a

---

<sup>\*</sup> Discourse of Religion, p. 44.

<sup>†</sup> Miscellanies, p. 309. Compare pp. 352, 353.

revelation from God can be of any service to us. It admits, indeed, the existence of some such principles as capacities or tendencies, but fails to enunciate them, or to bring them out with such clearness and force as their great importance demands. For, notwithstanding the singular aberrations and superstitions of man, he is essentially a religious being; that is to say, he is made for God and for duty, and has certain great elementary convictions, capacities and susceptibilities, to which all external revelations must make their appeal. Fallen indeed, he yet carries within him the traces of a better nature, the aboriginal, though perverted capacities of a religious life. Hence the race, as such, has always had some idea of religion and retribution. "That which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them." Man has reason, conscience, affection, the image of God in the soul, though greatly clouded by error and sin, upon which the truth and Spirit of God may act with success. So that the revelation without meets the revelation within, and the union is renovation and eternal life. In the eagerness of his argument, the author of "*The Eclipse of Faith*" throws too much doubt upon this original and indestructible peculiarity of the human constitution. He does not, indeed, deny it; nay, he recognizes its existence in some imperfect form, but he leaves it too much in shadow.

Another thing which leaves a feeling of painful disappointment, is, he permits Harrington to die with his doubts, having urged upon him the claims of religion only on the ground of common probabilities and prudence. He ought to have taken higher ground; for though not demonstrative, in the scientific sense of that expression, Christianity presents higher claims upon the reason and the conscience of man, than the merely probable or prudential. It has "a demonstration and a power" peculiar to itself, and comes to the heart with the highest authority and certainty. It is adapted to man, to his intellect, his conscience and his affections. It does not demonstrate itself dialectically, but so to speak, intuitively; that is, it vindicates its divinity by its absolute moral perfection, its immediate, all-transforming beauty. In a word, it is full of God. He that rejects it does violence to his better nature. He opposes God speaking in his Word; above all, speaking in his Son Jesus Christ. Indeed, it is morally impossible for a good man, a holy man, or a God-inspired man, to reject the God in Christ, that is, the absolute beauty, purity and goodness, embodied in that transcendent and adorable life. He may cherish doubts in reference to some historical facts, or doctrinal beliefs, pertaining to Christ's earthly career, but he can



not deny his divine, unutterable love, his divine, unutterable power. Hence the infidel violates the highest reason, commits the greatest sin. "For this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."

But leaving our author to speak for himself, for we hope all our readers will procure the book, we wish here to make one or two remarks on the eclipse of faith peculiar to the present day. That it is quite common can not be doubted. That it has invaded some of our schools and colleges, is well known. A few of our literary men are deeply tainted with its influence. It is increasing somewhat, in various directions, and creating for itself a certain style of literature. It embraces considerable talent and æsthetic culture, and will perhaps have quite a run.

Its essential cause, of course, lies back of all exterior phenomena, for it is itself a phenomenon, having its origin in the heart. Christianity is too positive, too holy for many minds; hence they modify or reject it. Thus far, most of our milder skeptics have been content with modifying it. But bolder spirits are tired of this. They want something new, something adapted to the spirit of the age, they say; that is, as we interpret the demand, something adapted to their spirit. Not willing to abandon religion in the abstract, they wish to get rid of it in the concrete. Hence they reject historical Christianity, and fall back upon what they term absolute religion, that is, the spirit without the form, the soul without the body. In fine, they reject all of Christianity which does not suit them, retaining only a few grand truths, in their most abstract shape, which they can work into any system they please, whether natural or supernatural, whether theistic or pantheistic. Thus they want a religion without regeneration, a worship without prayer, a redemption without Christ!

The immediate occasion of this movement, however, is found in the free and feverish activity of the age. Men are running to and fro, and knowledge is increased. Investigation advances. Speculation and theory are afloat. The pendulum swings rapidly and violently to extremes. All sorts of notions, philosophical, religious and practical, are propounded and received; hence, infidelity comes out more readily from its secret recesses and makes more noise in the world. Not that there is less religion, or that Christianity has lost its aggressive power. It is stronger, if we may so speak, this day than it ever was. Its triumphs are more extended and permanent. But character is more clearly revealed. Men more readily find their places, whether infidel or Christian.

Soon we shall have only two parties in the deadly struggle of opinion, infidels and Christians. The alternative will be Christianity or nothing.

We are not alarmed, therefore, at the spread of skeptical notions. They will explode one of these days and purify the atmosphere.

In the mean while it is mournful to see the ruin of individuals. Mournful especially, to see skepticism seizing our young men, some of them perhaps, within our own homes, or in our own churches.

Hence, the importance of watching the movement and meeting it with a manful energy. We are greatly impressed with the conviction that clergymen especially, ought to arm themselves for the contest, for they may be called to meet it when they least expect it.

An instance of such *eclipse of faith* has come within our own observation, and we append two letters, the one from a young skeptical friend, and the other a reply from his pastor. They may serve to give some hints of the practical working of the thinking among ourselves.

We will just premise that we had previously held some slight conversations with our young friend, upon the subject, and had loaned him a couple of books for his perusal, in the hope of enlisting him in a course of reading, which we hoped might banish his skepticism. The books were retained a long time, and returned with the letter. One of them was "The Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation," which we had found useful to others. The books, however, proved unsatisfactory, and no desire was expressed for more. What the issue will be, is not yet ascertained. It may be proper, however, further to state, that our correspondent had gone so far as to reject every thing miraculous or supernatural in Christianity, including the resurrection of Christ. In fact, he stood very nearly in the position of Theodore Parker. We will omit what he says respecting the books, except what is necessary to connect it with the remaining part of his letter.

"REV. DR. \_\_\_\_\_

"MY DEAR SIR:—I again desire to express to you my thanks for your kindness in sending me these books for perusal; and in returning them, desire also to apologize for having so long retained them. I have given them, as you requested, a 'candid and attentive reading,' but it is so long since, that I am now able only to give you the *general* impression their contents made upon my mind. I will not

undertake a review of the arguments set forth; this would be utterly superfluous. I have, therefore, only to say, which I do with equal regret and sincerity, that my perusal of the books has been attended with no very satisfactory results. The truth is, there was no peculiar adaptation of the character of the books to my mental mood. A man, in whose composition there is little of credulity, must be driven from his doubts, (*skepticism*, if it must be so,) by the power of convincing argument and irresistible proof, qualities, which in my feeble judgment, do not especially characterize either of these works. In default, therefore, of conviction, I am necessarily constrained, either to impeach my understanding, or the arguments employed. If the fault is mine, it exhibits my weakness rather than my criminality; for as *belief* (an involuntary operation of the mind) can have no merit, its negative, *disbelief*, can have no demerit. At the worst then, it is my misfortune to misapprehend the agreement of these ideas employed to convince me.

“‘The Philosophy,’ &c., is infinitely the superior work. There is much good logic and correct reasoning in it, and it is written in a liberal and dignified style. But herein lies the great fault; the author constantly adapts his *reasoning*, to the *circumstances* upon which he reasons, making it a subordinate and not a superior, the mere instrument of his theory. Many of his premises, to me, seem unsubstantial, and therefore his deductions lack efficacy. Had he been born a Turk and bred a Moslem, he might be able to prove with equal success, that the teachings of the Koran contain the true development of the method of man’s salvation. Why should it be necessary to employ even questionable logic, to establish Divine Truth? \* \* \*

“And here let me add, that there seems a sort of incongruity in the idea of teaching and proving Christianity, by means of prosaic and fine-spun argumentation. Is it a doctrine so abstruse and elaborate, as to require such means to elucidate it, and introduce it to the comprehension of the honest and earnest, though humble, truth-seeking mind? Does not this presumed necessity result rather from the perversions of the original truth, and the introduction of dogmas not essential, but actually foreign to its spirit? Ought not, rather, our religious doctrine to coincide so fully with the reason, as to secure its immediate reception by the commonest understanding, immediately upon admission thereto, so as to partake more of the intuitive than acquired?

“There are hundreds of metaphysical discussions upon matters pertaining to our eternal welfare, which are far above



the scope and capacity of an ordinary mind. It has long been an insoluble query with me, how comes it that men cherish such multifarious creeds, when there is but one true one? If our safety demands that we should know the right, why has not God so ordered it? I have heard you say that an *Infidel* was the most credulous of men. Is not this a solecism? It is not necessary that a man in rejecting one creed, should adopt some other, and he who disbelieves all, is the greatest infidel. In the 'Philosophy,' chapter xiv., it is shown how careful we should be *what we believe*. You have yourself recently warned us to avoid the delusions of Joanna Southcote, Swedenborg, Smith, Davis, *et alios*, and your remarks upon their deceptive systems struck me forcibly: 'Perhaps Swedenborg *did* hold converse with spirits, and catch glimpses of the other world, but how do *we* know it? *Where is the proof?*' Ah! here is the root of all my difficulty. How often have I uttered this question, how vainly sought a satisfactory response.

"I am not so much a positive disbeliever, as a doubter, rather an inquirer. I am shrouded in the darkness of mystery. I am groping in a labyrinth of distrust, from which I have vainly sought to extricate myself. How often have I prayed earnestly and sincerely that God would command his light to appear, which should guide me to the path of goodness and of truth. If the light is about me and I do not see it, I am the more unfortunate; but if my blindness is to be proved criminal, I am doubly unhappy. If I attempt to reconcile all the tenets of our doctrine, I am confused and frustrated by the contradiction of some, and by the incompatibility of others with my best judgment. No other test has God given me, with which to try them, but my reason, which though perhaps too feeble, can be my only guide. If my reason is not to be relied upon concerning this, the most important topic to which I can apply it, how can I trust its conclusions in examining any other? If I examine these tenets *rationaly*, as it appears to me I should, I am confronted by numberless queries, which multiply indefinitely, like the hydra's heads, as I attempt to dispose of them.

"If God is infinitely wise, why should we be uneasy concerning our destiny? If infinitely good, what occasion have we for fearing him? If infinitely powerful, why is *sin*, his antagonism, permitted to exist? If the knowledge of him and his will is the most necessary, why is it not the clearest and most evident? If He has spoken, why is not the universe convinced? If the word of God is designed for all, and is plain and harmonious, why does it admit of such a contra-

riety of constructions, and give rise to so much diversified and unending controversy? The infraction of nature's immutable law; the oneness of three distinct existences; the union of Divinity and Humanity in the same person, are all allowed to be inscrutable mysteries, yet demanding credence. But by what mental process am I to arrive at a belief in that which I can not conceive, except by the positive and irresistible evidence of my senses? Did the Divine nature of Christ suffer at his death, and is the Atonement so efficacious that a man is saved by less virtue *now* than before, and if so, is not faith, as a saving virtue, made superior to goodness? Was it in accordance with the will of God, that Christ was put to death, and if so, were not the murderous Jews mere executors of his manifest desire? If justice demands the punishment of the guilty, how can its ends be satisfied by vicarious suffering? If a man truly converted to God, is sustained to the end by his grace, it is hard to comprehend how sinless angels could have rebelled against his goodness and power, a circumstance, concerning which there is not the slightest allusion in the Pentateuch. That Moses should have failed to teach these important truths, the personality of an evil spirit, the resurrection of the dead and the immortality of the soul, is equally a matter of mystery to me, as that the wisest of men should have actually treated the matter as a fable. (Ecclesiastes, c. iii. v. 19, &c.)

"Concerning the ethics taught by our Saviour, as a general thing, no one can dissent from their purity and truth. But, to instance two or three exceptions, it does not appear perfectly clear to me, why an injured man should, instead of resenting, invite further injury, as this would seem to embolden the wicked by impunity, and degrade the virtuous by servility; or why a debauched and prodigal son should receive more paternal favor than an obedient and virtuous one; or why the same wages should be given to him who has wrought but one hour, as to him who has borne the heat and burden of the day. I might multiply my queries and suggestions to an indefinite but altogether useless extent, for the subject is one upon which I have pondered much, and which has produced in my mind, a deal of disquietude. They may be regarded by you, as equally unworthy a sensible or an honest man, but they will at least serve to show you how sadly my faith is shattered. I would I were a true-hearted, wise and virtuous man, but no one can be more sensible of his follies and faults than myself. Yet, weak as I may be, in constant conflict with the strength of surrounding temptations, I never will confess to such a depravity of heart and

enormity of guilt, as to deserve future suffering, inconceivable in intensity and eternal in duration. Nor, on the other hand, should I feel to merit infinite and unending beatitude, on the ground of having believed in statements that were utterly inadmissible to my comprehension, or in doctrines totally at variance with my most conscientious convictions.

"You will do me the justice to believe, that what I have said, is with the utmost reverence for that sublime religion in which I have been taught to trust, and which I shall never cease to respect.

"Very respectfully and truly, yours.

"\_\_\_\_\_"

REPLY.

"\_\_\_\_\_"

"MR. \_\_\_\_\_"

"DEAR SIR:—Your letter has, by no means, surprised me, for the very manner in which you received the books, though courteous in the highest degree, and the little interest you have evinced in prosecuting the investigation, have led me to fear that your mind was fatally pre-occupied, and that no arguments however satisfactory, would be likely to produce upon you any decided impression. I regret to say, that I have the same apprehension with reference to the effect of my preaching, to which you listen with apparent interest. It will give me great pleasure to know that my fears are groundless; but my chief hope now is that your mind, agitated by doubts and exhausted by negations, will begin to hunger and thirst after righteousness. Doubt is often but the premonitory symptom of a deep and inextinguishable famine of the soul.

"I am convinced, after all, that the whole question in cases similar to yours, turns upon serving or not serving God: were that vital question settled, the provisions of mercy in the gospel would be eagerly sought as the only effectual aid in securing the great object of life. When the heart is grateful and submissive, the intellect easily discerns the beauty of such a religion as Christianity.

"Your faith is indeed 'sadly shattered,' and I fear that your reason, upon which you so confidently rely, is also 'sadly shattered' in consequence. Your methods of reasoning seem to me singularly illogical and contradictory. If carried out, they would sweep away the last vestiges not only of Christianity, but of all religion. For example: you conclude if God is good, we need have no solicitude for our destiny; if



almighty, that sin can not or ought not to exist. 'If infinitely powerful,' is your language, 'why is sin, his antagonism, permitted to exist?' Now, my dear sir, reason, to be good for anything, must employ itself about *facts*, which in this case, and in some others, you seem utterly to forget. Sin, suffering, death, I know are fearful things; but here they are, and our first inquiry ought to be, how shall we conquer them, how secure our everlasting salvation? Indifference to such an issue is madness! You seem to infer also, that if the Word of God is true and designed for all, all, on that simple ground, must receive it. Is a true thing then, always received and appreciated in this world? Because it is not received, because men differ in opinion respecting it, you conclude it false! Is that logical? You allow, I suppose, some form of religion to be good and true. You speak, indeed, of 'that sublime religion in which you have been taught to trust.' Is that universally received and acknowledged? What is it? Who believe it; who, above all, act upon it? A meager minority, I am sure. On your principles of reasoning then, it must be false. It can not possibly be the religion of God. In this way, your methods of logic would extinguish all religion.

"Indeed, I have been exceedingly struck with the fact that I have seen most of your objections and difficulties recently urged by certain German atheists, not only against Christianity, but against what, for the want of a better word, we sometimes call Natural Religion, the existence of God, the duty of worship and the immortality of the soul. They say, 'If religion is a benefit, why is it not instinctively known and acknowledged? Why is there such diversity of opinion respecting it? No two persons agree as to who or what God is. And even granting,' they add, 'that such a Being exists, supposing him omnipotent and benevolent, why is *evil* in the world? Nature is immutable, its laws therefore can not be broken;' (thus playing on the word *broken*, as you do on the term *infraction*, which means the same thing;) 'why then should we be anxious about our destiny? Our *senses*, and the convictions thence derived, are our only guide. All we have to do then, is to develop ourselves, thus obeying not an imaginary God, but our own instincts. Nay, why should we fear God, if he exists; and if he does not exist, why should we fear nature? But we can not *conceive* God, or the soul, or heaven, or immortality; and what we can not conceive, we can not believe.\*

---

\* Cicero informs us that the skeptical philosophers of his day, rejected the immortality of the soul, because they could not form the conception of a disembodied spirit.

Therefore, we do not believe in God, the soul or immortality. Only what is demonstrated to the senses can be true. Nature is our only guide, and nature is immutable. So we are safe enough. Death is but an eternal sleep. There can be no infraction of nature's laws, consequently, there can be no sin, no guilt, no punishment. The sooner we get rid of a religion, which is only a superstition and a bugbear, the better. Let us live and be merry. The earth is ours and all that is in it!

"I do not see why all this is not just as logical as your method with Christianity. You reject all mysteries. Then you must reject God, the soul and immortality.

"You intimate that we are not responsible for our belief. Your logic upon this subject is as follows, putting it into technical shape: Whatever is involuntary, involves no responsibility. But faith is an involuntary act of the mind; therefore, faith involves no responsibility. Now, what is called the major proposition here, is the principal thing. If true at all, as you state it, it must be true *universally*. Do not flinch from your logic. Well, then, the following propositions must be true also: Any act or state of mind, which can be proved involuntary, in the same sense as belief, has no moral character, that is, it has neither merit nor demerit. But our affections, emotions, dispositions and even passions, are all as much as belief, involuntary. Belief is produced by its appropriate object, evidence or cause. So are the former by their appropriate objects or causes. Love can not be forced, nor fear, nor even lust. We can not will ourselves into a state of affection, of serenity and joy, or of hatred and rage. They flow spontaneously from their appropriate objects or causes. On your logic then, whatever form they take, they must be innocent; they are neither good nor bad, but simply indifferent!

"Further, you will allow that *right* corresponds to *truth*, and *error* to *wrong*. But *truth* is received on evidence, and is a matter of *belief*, involuntary belief you say, of course. So also right is acknowledged or done on the ground of its intrinsic and eternal truth or reality. It, too, ultimately depends upon evidence, the evidence of consciousness. Truth and right then, go together, as error and wrong go together. In a word, they are matters of faith, and depend the one upon the other. Is this faith, too, involuntary? Of course, on your principles and assumptions, it must be so. Then, the logical inference is inevitable, that truth and error, right and wrong, are neither of them matters of responsibility. Morally, they are the same.

"Thus, all moral distinctions are abolished. The entire

foundation, not only of faith and piety, but of duty and virtue, is destroyed.

"The fact is, however, that most of our acts and states of mind are both voluntary and involuntary; and chiefly for this simple reason, that we are not only free agents, and thence capable of choice and responsibility, but that all our acts and states of mind are linked together, a fact which you have altogether overlooked. Thus, though in one sense involuntary, as in the case of a feeling or affection, and perhaps of a conviction or belief, in its ultimate realization, they may be all voluntary also, in their causes and connections. We are not merely passive, but active. A man is voluntary when he deliberately ties a noose around his neck and swings himself off into empty space, though the death which inevitably ensues, after he is thus swung off, and all volition ceases, may be sufficiently involuntary. If it were possible for him to change his mind on the instant, and just before the fatal issue has come, it would make no difference in the case whatever. Let us never forget that will is given us as the helm of the soul, now to compel us to the truth and right, and now to repel us from error and wrong. This is the executive power of the soul, and if sound and pure, capable of controlling the soul itself, holding it to the *truth*, and compelling it to receive it, however distasteful, on the ground of its appropriate evidence, and not only to receive it, but to act upon it, and so transmit the truth into duty and virtue. Conscience also, which gives the sense of obligation, stands by the side of the soul, to strengthen and uphold it in its self-denying resolves. Of two men, one will instinctively and joyfully believe the truth, while the other will instinctively and basely reject it. And why? Because the one is a good, while the other is a bad man. Hence, we are bound to believe the truth, and do what is right. It is at our peril we reject the one or disobey the other.

"But, on your logic, truth and error, right and wrong, are equally without moral character, which is just the same as saying that black and white, food and poison, God and the devil, are precisely alike, and equally good, whenever a man imagines or believes them to be so!

"You may reply, that they are only such to any one when he sincerely believes so and so, to which I rejoin, if he believes at all, of-course he believes *sincerely*. There are not two modes of doing an involuntary thing, are there? A man either believes or does not believe. If he does not believe the error, and yet pretends to do so, and acts accordingly, he is doubly lost. But if he does believe it, his sincerity, I am



sure, will not make black white, or wrong right, or poison food, or hell heaven.

"Surely, you have not yet to learn that in the great majority of cases, our dispositions and affections govern our opinions, especially those upon which depend responsibility and action. If, therefore, the whole current of a man's life be wrong, his reason will soon follow. Reason, it is true, is our only guide in the belief of truth, provided we mean by reason, our whole mental and moral nature, including intellect, conscience and affection. Let sin, however, mingle in that nature and control its decisions: what will be the result? Were you and I pure, humble, grateful, devout, we should instinctively recognize the truth, and not only so, but cheerfully obey it. 'He that doeth the will of God shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.'

"Light and beauty are congenial to the healthy eye, because they are made for each other. So, truth and duty are congenial to the healthy soul; for they too, are made for each other. But remember the eye does not create the light: it only receives it. So, reason must be content to receive the truth, not to invert or modify it. A perverted reason will reject the truth, as a perverted or diseased eye rejects the light. Hence, the first test of truth is its actual and joyful reception by a healthy soul, that is, a soul reverent and meek, as well as honest and clear, a soul hungering and thirsting after righteousness. A good man turns to the light, and drinks life from its beams, as the flowers turn to the sun, and grow beautiful under his radiance. Hence, a second test of truth is its practical effects, in other words, its quickening and transforming influence. It thus proves itself not merely a theory, grand and symmetrical, but a power, life-giving and immortal. A divine teacher or Saviour in whom it should be embodied, would be 'the way, the truth and the life.'

"It is on this ground that the argument in 'The Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation,' and works of a kindred character, amounts to a moral demonstration.\* Christianity does what no other religion ever did, or can do. It transforms (regenerates) the heart, and unites it to God by a divine, all-conquering affection. It gives the *central truth*, and the *all-controlling* motive to love, gratitude, joy, submission, devotion, burning, boundless and eternal. It has its difficulties; but it solves all other difficulties with which the reason of man, unaided, has long struggled in vain. It gives rest to the in-

---

\* Thomas Erskine, in his "Internal Evidences," states the argument with still greater force and precision.

telleet, the conscience and the heart. In a word, it unites the finite with the infinite, man with God, time with eternity, the life that now is with the life that is to come. Fully received in its great elementary principles, it must save, it must renovate and bless us forever.

"Its truth, then, is independent of all external or historic testimony, though this also it possesses. For, as the invention of the steam engine, for the first time described, in some distant land where it was never seen, to a truly capable and scientific mind, would prove its own reality and value, much more would the successful working of the engine, actually introduced among the people, prove it, by propelling ships, without wind and tide, over the waves of the sea. The steam engine, however, to be good for any practical uses, must be thoroughly understood and skillfully applied; so also, Christianity to be effectual for the salvation of the soul, must be received and obeyed.

"You say the argument is applicable to Islamism. Impossible; for the only absolute truth of Islamism, taken from Christianity, as every reader of history knows, is the unity of God. Perfection, pure, spiritual, eternal, is not its end and aim; but material delight, sensual splendor and pleasure among the sacred houries of a voluptuous paradise; on which ground it can never regenerate the heart. The idea of the divinity, and the practice of justice and alms-giving, inculcated in the Koran, have somewhat assisted civilization; but though superior to heathenism, the form of society in Mohammedan Turkey, Persia, Arabia and Egypt, is infinitely inferior to that of Christianity. It has long ago reached its culminating point, while that of Christianity is destined to a yet wider and loftier development.

"You wonder that the immortality of the soul is not specifically taught by Moses. Your wonder ought to cease when you know that he teaches the doctrine of God, supreme, omnipresent and eternal, and of a spiritual life in Him, in which immortality is involved. Our Saviour has settled this point forever, by showing that the 'God of Abraham, of Isaac and Jacob,' quoting the language of Jehovah to Moses, used in reference to these ancient worthies, long after they were dead and gone, 'is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' What was the hope of the dying Jew, of Abraham and all the patriarchs, of Samuel and all the prophets, but the hope of immortality?

"You wonder also why it is ridiculed by Solomon. I have simply to say that it is not ridiculed by Solomon, but plainly taught when he says that 'the spirit of a man goeth upward,

but the spirit of a beast goeth downward.' Most clearly does he distinguish between the body and the soul when he says 'that the dust returns to the earth as it was, but the spirit to God who gave it.' In the bosom of God, surely the spirit of a good man is sufficiently immortal. In the mere matter of disease and of dying, man, indeed, has no 'pre-eminence' over the inferior animals; but hear, according to this very writer, the conclusion of the whole matter: 'Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole of man.' Yes, as the original has it, 'the whole of man,' not his duty merely, but his destiny, his all, *the whole of man for time and eternity.*

"The book of Ecclesiastes is a dramatized experience; the writer speaks sometimes in one character and sometimes in another; one part, therefore, can not be quoted against the other. His general drift is clear enough, which is to prove 'the vanity of man as mortal,' the folly and madness of sin, and the inestimable worth of a true, practical godliness.

"You amaze me by suggesting objections to the ethics of Christ, which fundamentally, and in their development, are perfect; especially, you amaze me by objecting to the exercise of the divine clemency, in the case of the repenting prodigal, a sinner's only hope. Read that affecting parable once more; for surely you have either forgotten it, or utterly misconceived its spirit. 'Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine;' as if he had said, I do not love thee the less, because I rejoice now, 'all that I have *is thine*,' not a single 'fatted calf,' on some joyful occasion, but *every thing is thine*; 'it was meet that we should rejoice and make merry, for this my son was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found.'

"Singular, too, you should prefer the spirit of *resentment* to that of *forgiveness*, and really imagine that blow for blow, vengeance for vengeance, is the true method of reform! Wonderful that you should have difficulty with the generous, the godlike doctrine of overcoming evil with good, of suffering wrong rather than doing it, and curing the curse of humanity, not by cursing, but by blessing, not by revenge, but by love!

"That all legitimate government should be sustained, that men ought calmly and legally to defend their sacred rights, and that violations, or, if you please, *infractions* of the law ought to be punished, our Saviour and his apostles plainly teach. But that individuals ought not to resist and retaliate, but like himself when dying on the accursed tree, say, 'Father forgive them, for they know not what they do,' he teaches



and enforces by an eloquence of word and deed which ought to convince the world. The expressions—'turn to him the other (cheek) also'—'go with him twain'—'two miles instead of one'—'let him have thy cloak also'—'give to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow from thee, turn not thou away,' are only strong, idiomatic phrases to teach a generous, forgiving temper. In fact, they but enforce, in their striking brevity and natural exaggeration, the sublime and original truth, (which even you in the nineteenth century, and in Christian New England, do not understand or appreciate,) that evil is not to be overcome by evil, selfishness by selfishness, revenge by revenge, but by good, by love, benevolence and pity. Shattered, indeed, nay, utterly wasted, must that faith be, which finds deformity in the divine injunction—'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and do good to them that despitefully use you and persecute you.'

"As to the '*Three in One*,' or the '*One in Three*,' that is, the One, infinite God, as Father, Son and Holy Spirit—Father supreme, invisible and eternal, Son, as manifest in the flesh and visible among men, and Holy Spirit, as transforming and blessing the world, there need be no practical difficulty. To us, if we believe the Bible, there can be only *one God*, not three Gods; and yet the divine is equally manifest in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Nor ought there to be any difficulty with the union of the divine and the human, or the manifestation of the divine through the human, any more than the union of the material and the spiritual, the mortal and the immortal, in the person of every man. Indeed, the *Incarnate Mystery*, or God dwelling in the most sacred of all temples, uniting, so to speak, the extremes of heaven and earth, and so coming down to our imperfect, suffering state, that he might take us to his bosom, and make us partakers of 'the divine nature,' is the very glory of the gospel, the very glory of man. That we should be saved, moreover, by vicarious suffering, is by no means strange, for our highest and holiest blessings come to us through the sorrows of others, voluntarily borne, on our behalf; by the tears and anguish of mothers, by the blood of patriots, saviors and martyrs. Evermore and in all lands, the good suffer not only for the good, but for the bad; so that their virtues, through agony, shame and death, inure to the benefit of the unthankful and unworthy. And if justice, immutable and eternal, should be satisfied with the rich and immaculate sacrifice of the Son of God, and should accept it on behalf of the penitent, who, I ask, has a right to complain? Surely not you, or I, since we

need it so much. That we should be justified, moreover, not by our meager, earth-born virtue, fitly styled by some of the old writers, "our ragged righteousness," but through union with one truly virtuous and truly divine; and that a holy life should flow, not from external endeavors, or mechanic forms, but from faith, that is, a heart-union with Christ, producing love and joy, is the most natural, the most philosophical thing conceivable. Surely, my friend, you must be blind indeed, to suppose that Christianity postpones "goodness" to a *credo*, or a *pater noster*, on the surface of the intellect or of the lips. Oh no, goodness is the very end of our Saviour's death, the final aim and issue of the whole Christian faith. And the only difference between the saints of the old dispensation and those of the new, is that the one looked forward, and the others look backward, to Christ. Both drink of the same spiritual fountain, both make the same pilgrimage, and both will meet, through Christ, who reconciles and unites all, in the same heaven.

"You ask, strangely enough, 'Was it in accordance with the divine will that Christ should be put to death, and if so were not the murderous Jews mere executors of his manifest desire?' It was, doubtless, in accordance with God's design, that Jesus should die, as a manifestation of his love and pity to men, just as it is in accordance with his manifest desire that martyrs and patriots should seal their testimony by their blood, and thus, through magnanimity in extremities, enthrone justice and freedom in the minds of men. But no thanks in such cases, to their persecutors and murderers! The design or act of God is one thing; the design or act of man is another. So, also, the act of the martyr is one thing, heroic and beautiful, well-pleasing to God, and all generous souls; but the act of the executioner is another, at once base and wicked, displeasing to God and hateful to man.

"Some habit of analysis, of separation and distinction among things that differ, in the sphere especially of religion and morals, is of great importance. As in that other question you ask touching the extent of our Saviour's sufferings. That divinity is superior to suffering, in the ordinary sense of the term, must be conceded; but that he is divested of all sympathy with suffering, can never be proved. Nay, this may be assumed, from the nature of God, as a being not simply of absolute intellection, and infinite power, but of gracious affection. The spirit of man, I suppose, in itself considered, is incapable of physical suffering, yet it feels any wound inflicted on the body; and this, by the way, is a profound mystery. The soul does not die; dissolution affects

the body only; and yet the soul feels it all. To the spirit, death is only a dark and painful transition to a new sphere of being. So the divine spirit of Jesus, properly speaking, did not die, did not physically suffer, but it sympathized at once, in the mournful condition of man, and in the agony of the cross. The divinity sanctifies the temple in which it dwells, and the altar upon which it receives the burnt-offering; so the divinity of Jesus Christ made his *oblation* on the cross the richest the universe has ever seen. But the atonement of Christ is not, as you seem to deem it, a punishment for sin, a *quid pro quo*, but a sacrifice, graciously accepted by love and justice, for the benefit of the penitent. If forgiven, the sinner is not punished as he deserves; he suffers nothing; nay he partakes of endless felicity. The only suffering in the case, is that of the Redeemer. Such suffering, then, is not punishment for sin, but sacrifice for sin, not perdition for perdition, but sacrifice averting the perdition of the penitent. 'He who knew no sin was made sin (a sin-offering) for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' The death of Christ does not annul the laws of eternal order. 'He came not to *annul* but fulfill.' Thus 'the ends of justice are satisfied by vicarious suffering;' for thereby the sinner is transformed, forgiven and saved. Things are brought back to their original harmony. God is glorified and man is redeemed.

"But you demand plain and positive proof. What do you mean? Historical proof, the proof of facts? You have it. Christendom, with its new and divine ideas, its hallowed memories, its glorious literature, its lofty civilization, its rich and peculiar experience, is a fact. The Gospels, the Epistles, are facts, genuine and authentic. The primitive Christians, the apostles, are facts. Paul, a converted enemy, is a fact. John, who lay in the bosom of Jesus, is a fact. Jesus Christ, incarnate love and purity, is a fact. His death, his resurrection, are facts. Wondrous transformations ascribed to the Spirit, change in the hearts of thousands, a new era begun, new views, new feelings, new forces in society, the early church, imperfect as every thing human, but palpitating with life, the present church, embosomed in the form of Christian civilization, the noblest on earth, spreading too and enveloping the globe; these, these all are historical facts.

"Do you ask something more special? Gifts, tongues, prophecies, miracles, supernatural power, supernatural knowledge, above all, supernatural love, such as would naturally accompany the establishment of a divine religion? You have them. Above all, you have the crowning miracle of



incarnate divinity, controlling nature and man, and the whole realm of spirits, quickening the dead, giving life to the soul, conquering sin, anguish and death, rising from the dead, and ascending into heaven! Never man spake like this man—never man lived—never man died like this man. The pagan centurion, standing by his cross, owned his divinity; and even Rousseau, blind, perverted as he was, saw and confessed his glory. 'The Gospel,' said he, "can not be a fiction. The inventor would be a greater miracle than the hero. What folly to compare the son of Sophroniscus, with the son of Mary. For if Socrates died like a philosopher, Jesus died like a God.'

"But you dislike to be thought credulous, and imagine that to believe no creed may be the highest proof of wisdom. Well, I suppose it sounds to you like a paradox to say that infidels are guilty of that which they specially renounce and abhor, namely, credulity. Doubtless some of them are constitutionally free from this bias, doubters who doubt of every thing, doubt even of doubt itself, and know not but they and their skepticism are such stuff as dreams are made of. Possibly some of them are candid, but deluded, or it may be rationally crazy, *ferox ratione*, like the metaphysicians of the Hegelian school, who believe in *nihil*, or nothing, as the origin and end of all things, or that strange old theosopher, who permitted his nails and beard to grow and gather natural filth, as the highest development of the divinity! Others may be honest, nay even pure men, at least in their own view; for the man does not live who does not regard himself as perfectly fair and honest in his way. After all, I am prepared to prove, that generally speaking, infidels are a marvelously credulous race. Their credulity, indeed, does not lie in the direction of 'pure and undefiled religion;' it only comes to their aid in their desperate attempts to get rid of its claims. Their power of believing negatives; the fact that many of them actually believe and maintain that nature can exist without a God, according to Atkinson and Hume; that man is his own God, that he is actually divine, according to Emerson and Strauss; that there never was such a person as Jesus Christ, according to Volney, who makes him a mythic personage, like the god Saturn; that the apostles were impostors and cheats, according to Voltaire and Paine, or enthusiasts who cheated themselves, according to Gibbon and Parker; that Christianity, so entirely free from the faults of either, took its rise among the Essenes, of Palestine, or the Therapeutæ, of Egypt, according to Taylor and Lessing; nay, that even Theism is absurd, and the only God worthy of homage is social organization,

according to Feuerbach and Heine; the extreme readiness of this class of men, to believe, on the instant, all sorts of extravagant, scientific or historical statements, which make against the Bible, those for example, in reference to the zodiac of Dendera, the age of Mount Etna, and the fabulous annals of Hindostan and China; their preposterous theories of creation, as the primitive electric mind from which spring all things, according to some, or the primitive electric stardust, according to others, the development of men from monkeys, as Monboddo believed, or from fishes and reptiles, according to Doctor Grimes, or from all sorts of things, beginning with an ovum or embryo, of infinitesimal size, and advancing, by a natural development, through reptile, fish and fowl, to the stature of a perfect man, as the followers of Oken, in Germany, and the author of *The Vestiges of Creation*, stoutly maintain; their propensity to rush into puerile notions and absurd schemes, for the renovation of society, as in the case of the Socialists, St. Simoneans and others, in France and Germany, with the followers of Andrew Jackson Davis, philosopher, prophet and apostle of the nineteenth century, author of *The Great Harmonia*, and grand indorser and interpreter of spiritual *rappings*, as a new revelation from heaven; all these facts are a decisive proof of their extreme credulity. Why, Miss Martineau, who actually tried, as she herself informs us, to mesmerize a sick cow, and made passes at a raging bull, on the other side of a quickset hedge, so 'tis said, though this latter may be apocryphal, goes into raptures at the grand discovery of Mr. Atkinson, her famous spiritual correspondent, that there is no God, no soul, no immortality! She is perfectly delighted, so she tells us, in her marvelous correspondence with said Atkinson, at the thought, that after death, she will pass into the very condition she was in before she was born!\*

"The fact is, it takes some vigor and discrimination of mind, as well as strength of purpose, to separate the false from the true, and cling to the lofty, self-denying principles of Christianity, amid temptation and doubt. Universal skepticism is a sign, not of strength, but of weakness. Any mind can suggest difficulties, and it is a facile thing to say that all religions are false. Sometimes the stomach becomes so dyspeptic as to be incapable of digesting the lightest nutriment. So there

---

\* She pities her brother, the famous Unitarian preacher, and Mr. Fox, the rationalistic orator, of London, that they still linger a short distance behind her, but at the same time congratulates them on their progress toward the abyss of Atheism!

are spiritual dyspeptics, incorrigible doubters, with minds so imbecile as to reject with disgust the simplest truths.

"In one part of your letter you refer to the force of surrounding temptations, which you desire to resist. Are you quite sure that you are entirely free from their terrible contamination? Is your imagination pure? Is your heart free from all ambition and vanity? I know something of the heart of youth, and you will forgive me if in my profound anxiety for your welfare, I suggest that here, more than any where else, you may discover the root of your difficulty. All I know of you is favorable to the integrity of your morals. There are few young men in your circumstances for whom I cherish a higher respect. But the heart is strangely wayward, and alas! 'sadly shattered' by sin.

"You do not feel that you deserve, imperfect as you are, 'everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power.' Are you quite certain that you are the proper judge in such a case? You add, however, that you do not feel that you could merit infinite and unending beatitude, on the ground of belief in doctrines which you deem absurd. Of course not. But the true antithesis to the above, and that to which, on reading your letter, I supposed you were about to give expression, would have been, that you could not merit inconceivable and unending beatitude on the ground of an imperfect virtue. For surely, if we do not merit perdition by our sin, we do not merit heaven by our virtue.

"But I forbear. As you say, objections in your case, like the hydra's head, multiply indefinitely. No sooner are some answered, than thousands spring up in their room. Surely, there must be some vital source, as in the hydra's head, from which they spring; and may it not be worth while to inquire whether that evil root is not in your heart?

"I have written so much, not with any sanguine hope of convincing you; for I fear, that in your *present mood*, you are beyond my reach, or the reach of any man, whatever power of argument he may possess, but as an evidence of my deep interest in your welfare. Mere debate is useless. Prayer is better. You say you have prayed earnestly, for light. Do, for heaven's sake, continue this exercise, with correspondent practical and candid investigation, and the blessing will finally come. I would commend to you the study of the Life of Christ, as developed in the Gospels. My most earnest supplication will be that you may be led to the truth; that your reason illumined, and your heart renewed, you may be conducted to the bosom of infinite love, and unending felicity in Jesus Christ.



"One thing more, however, I will say, in conclusion; you are right in supposing true religion to be a simple and beautiful thing. Indeed, it is simple as the falling dew and the growing corn; simple, in fact, as the great laws and processes of nature, gravitation, vegetation, chemical affinity, and so forth; but like them, also, it may be misunderstood and perverted. You are wrong, therefore, in concluding because Christianity does not seem simple and beautiful to you, and some others, that it is not such. Certainly, it needs no defense; above all, it needs no elaborate, long-spun arguments to prove its value. Like the sun, it shines by its own light, beautifying and blessing all. Thousands and tens of thousands, in all ages, have basked in its beams, and felt its quickening power, as they have felt the warmth and beauty of the common sun, without a thought of analyzing its elements, or the mysterious laws by which it acts upon nature and man. But weak and diseased eyes are not able to bear it. To them it appears dismal and repulsive. God opened the heart of Lydia, and took the scales from the eyes of Paul, to discern its glory. I hope he will also open yours. Then what appears dark, metaphysical, mysterious, will be luminous as the day. But remember that the day lies in the bosom of night. The stars, so pure and peaceful, are set in a firmament of gloom. All around them, and beyond them is the infinite, the inconceivable. The finite hovers ever on the border of the infinite. What is known is a scrap of land, or a cluster of islands in a boundless ocean, or, to retain our figure, a few twinkling stars in the depths of infinite space. You and I, then, may admire these stars, and call them simple and beautiful, but not without a feeling of wonder and mystery, for they are but fine specks in the ineffable night. Great is the mystery of nature. Great, also, is the mystery of godliness, of infinite love and purity, manifest in the flesh. Refulgent, indeed, that 'brighter sun,' with its attendant stars, shining sweetly in the hemisphere of Christian faith; benignant, too, and blessed in their influence over the heart of man, but how mysterious and ineffable in their relations to the boundless ocean of being and thought, with which they are connected. May you live to catch their gleam; and as gliding over life's ocean, the night of death comes down upon you, may you be enabled, by their guidance, to steer right onward, and reach

"That peaceful shore,  
Where tempests never beat nor billows roar!"

With sincere affection,  
your friend and pastor,      T.

## ART. V.—DOCTRINAL PREACHING.

1. *Institutes of Theology*. By the late THOMAS CHALMERS, D. D., LL. D. In two volumes, pp. 542, 515. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1849.
2. *The Theological Lectures of the late Rev. DAVID BOGUE*, D. D. Edited by the Rev. JOSEPH SAMUEL C. F. FREY. Second edition. One volume, large 8vo., pp. 806. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1849.

PERSONAL religion is founded on knowledge. How small a portion of knowledge may take its possessor to heaven, it is not for us to say; but a man must know himself a sinner and Christ a Saviour, or eternally perish. Such seems to be the doctrine taught by our Lord in his farewell prayer: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." A dying heathen may just hear of Christ and die safe, but a living Christian will be strong, happy and useful in proportion to his growth "in the knowledge of Christ." Few things are more deplorable than the inclination indicated in many quarters, to be satisfied with a very small share of scriptural knowledge, and to maintain religion by a constant series of superficial excitements, and by incessant appeals to the passions of its professors. Such religion will always prove feeble; and its subject is liable to faint in his course, and will be easily drawn aside into the paths of error, provided always, the new path promises more excitement than the old one.

It will easily be imagined that the persons who are so fond of mere excitement, and those also who have but small love to evangelical doctrine, will be found opposed to any laborious study of truth as presented in systematic order. Hence, during the last thirty years we have been constantly meeting with persons crying out at the very top of their voices against creeds, catechisms, and systems of theology. Their professions of undivided attachment to the Bible have been proved to be mere *cant*, for no class of men have more widely departed from its doctrines; while time has shown that the superficial and merely pathetic instructions which have been given instead of the strong food of our strong fathers, have imparted no vigor; so that our apostle would say, "for this

cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep."

It is, however, a singular fact, that while all this opposition to systematic theological instruction has been going on, and the noisy "demonstration" has been incessant, more systems of theology have been published in this country and in Europe, than within the same number of years at any former period. Among ourselves, we remember at this moment, the systems of Dwight and Woods, and translations from the German of Knopp, and Storr, and Flatt; while in Great Britain, in addition to reprints of three of the works just named, they have furnished the very able systems of Hill, Dick, Bogue and Chalmers; all of which, we are glad to say, are reprinted in this country, and we believe have an increasing sale. None of these works can be studied without great advantage, though some of them are far more worthy of attention than others. The titles of two of them we have placed at the head of this article, on which to offer a few remarks, introductory to some observations we are desirous of presenting to the candid consideration of our readers, on a general and highly important subject.

Very little need be said of Dr. Chalmers or any of his works, as we presume our readers by this time, very generally, have perused all his productions, at least, the eighteen volumes which have been reprinted in this country by the Harpers and the Carters, which include probably whatever can be practically important for us to possess. The masterly life, written by his son-in-law, Dr. Hanna, is one of the most beautiful and useful biographical productions of the age, and deeply should we pity the young minister, who would not, if necessary, make some sacrifice to possess it. The extraordinary conversion of Dr. Chalmers long after his entrance on the ministry, the penetrating and comprehensive character of his mind, and the rich attractions of his style, will long make every thing he wrote extensively popular; and we can easily forgive what we consider objectionable in the casket, for the sake of the inestimable jewels of truth which we trust will be thus conveyed to millions. As to Dr. Chalmers' views of the importance of a systematic arrangement of divine truths, they are given in a letter to his friend, Dr. Andrew Thompson, of Edinburgh, under date, October 24, 1827: "To yourself, and for your own satisfaction, it is quite unnecessary that I should say anything to put down the nonsense which you tell me is in circulation about my hostility to systematic divinity—as if any science whatever could be taught in a way that was not systematic; or, as if there were



not the same harmony in the word of God to form the basis of a theological system, that there is in the works of God, and which forms the basis of our physical or philosophical systems." We are devoutly grateful that Dr. Chalmers became a professor of theology, and that his "Institutes" have been published. A critical examination would detect some minor errors, but we have, however, no heart to attempt such a task, but most earnestly commend them, as a whole, to our readers of every class, and especially to our professional brethren who are called to provide intellectual and spiritual food for our churches.

Dr. David Bogue was a native of Scotland, where he was born in the middle of the last century. He was well educated in early life, and took his degree of A. M., at the University of Edinburgh. In 1777, he became pastor of the Independent (Congregational) Church at Gosport, England, where he was very successful. In 1789, with the pecuniary assistance of several wealthy laymen, he commenced a Theological Institution, in which he trained many young ministers, who became eminent in their day, such as the late Doctor Morrison, of China, Dr. Styles, Dr. James Bennet, John Angell James and others. In 1794, he appealed, in the Evangelical Magazine, to the Pedobaptists of Great Britain and Ireland, on the subject of forming a Missionary Society, to which he had been prompted by letters from Messrs. Carey and Thomas, Baptist missionaries in India. In 1799, he was one of the founders of the Religious Tract Society, and wrote its first tract, which is still considered the standard, as to the character of the publications they issue. In 1807, his Seminary took a new form, and became more especially a Missionary Institution, which it remained till its close, after his death. He died suddenly at Brighton, where he had gone to attend several missionary services, in October, 1825.

In estimating the character of Dr. Bogue, we may remark that his mind, like his corporeal frame, was large, robust and rough. He seemed destitute of feeling, and performed whatever appeared to be his duty, with promptitude, energy and determined perseverance, well knowing how to work on the fears as well as conscientious convictions of his students and his congregation. Always conscientious and resolute, he sought only to accomplish present duty, and thought little of the future. Hence, after his death, his church and congregation were for many years in a state of confusion, and became almost extinct; and the Missionary Seminary, after its friends had tried several changes, was found to be constructed of decaying materials, and was united with the Congre-

gational College at Highbury, which in its turn, has merged into the New College, at St. John's Wood, London. We well remember the sturdy preacher and divine, nor can we ever forget the bigotry he showed toward the Baptists, scarcely allowing them to be Christians. Still he was a fine old Puritanical preacher, and well filled with duty, the days of seventy-five years.

In reference to the volume before us, its description may be given in a very few words. The custom of the worthy teacher was to write the syllabus of his lectures, and then to require his students to copy them; they had to consult the books referred to at the end of each lecture, all of which were in the library, and make such extracts as were illustrative of each subject; every day or two each student read to the doctor, in the presence of the other students, the progress he had made. The doctor frequently stopped them to propose questions, that he might ascertain the extent of their industry and understanding of the subject. Those lectures are divided into eight departments, and their whole number is three hundred and six. Mr. Frey has furnished us with the syllabus in a correct form, but we think we have seen in manuscript, better transcripts; probably, however, they might have been copied at a later period, when the doctor had made his system more complete. Certain it is that the Seminary at Gosport sent forth many excellent missionaries, preachers and divines; and if any man would thoroughly operate on these skeletons, and clothe them with words, first adding to his theological library, the best works of later years, and skillfully working these newly discovered mines, as well as the older ones, he would, assuredly be a divine "who need not be ashamed."\*

We confess that our principal object in this article is one suggested by the works rather than anything in the volumes themselves—a subject demanded by the present aspect of the world, and which had, to our own knowledge, much of the *practical* attention of both of the authors before us; we refer to *Doctrinal Preaching*.

By doctrinal preaching, we mean not the constant iteration of the common-places of orthodox belief, but the thorough discussion and inculcation of the great first principles of divine revelation, and especially those which constitute the peculiarities of the gospel of Christ. These great principles lie at the foundation of all true Christian experience, and

---

\* The Lectures of Doddridge are of a similar character, and would well repay perusal.

control and direct all true Christian conduct. Without sound doctrine, experience will become enthusiasm, and conduct will be influenced by no law. Doctrines are always to be preached as to their influence on the heart and conduct; while the experience of the Christian's inner life, and the manifestation of it in his deportment, should always be shown to be the natural tendency of Christian doctrine. Truth, or doctrine, acts on the heart, and the heart carries out the sublime results of the doctrine into the life. If ever, in the history of the world, these doctrines needed to be preached with distinctness and boldness, at one period more than another, it is now. Let us look well at this fact.

1. *In the Christian doctrine alone, is made known the foundation on which man can build his hope of salvation.* The Christian who well understands the New Testament system, is best qualified always to "give a reason for the hope that is in him;" and he has usually derived his clear views of the truth and of himself, from the well-instructed preacher, who led him by a straight path to the cross of Christ. We appeal to our brethren in the ministry, as to the kind of preaching which has been most successful, and which has produced the best converts in a season of religious revival. Has it been the declamatory, or even the melting appeal to the passions, which has perhaps, agitated the feelings for the moment; or has it not rather been the plain, forcible, uncompromising preaching of the doctrines of the apostasy, rebellion and spiritual helplessness of man, and the eternal misery to which he is exposed; the infinite grace of Christ in becoming a complete and infinitely willing Saviour, ready to give his mercy to all who trust in him; the necessity of the Holy Spirit to work in us to "will and to do of his good pleasure," and the absolute necessity, thence resulting, of a holy and virtuous life? The most useful minister is not he who tells his hearers that the world is very wicked, but leaves them to infer that *they* have escaped its corruptions, and may consider themselves safe for ever. He who would discharge his duty aright, and change rebels against Christ into his friends, will make the sinner feel "thou art the man," and never allow him to be at peace till he has placed his hopes for mercy on the atoning sacrifice of Christ. "The old-fashioned revivals" of which we sometimes speak, were produced by the bold annunciation of the strongest doctrines of Christianity, which like barbed arrows penetrated the hearts of unregenerate men; and who does not know that those who were thus "shut up into the faith" of Christ, were far better Christians than many who in modern times of excitement, thinking themselves such,



have "endured for a while," and then by pernicious coldness, or perhaps even something worse, have nearly destroyed all the little religion which could be found around them? Would the strong doctrines of Edwards in his sermons on "the justice of God in the damnation of sinners," or, "Sinners in the hands of an angry God," produce the feeble Christians whom we so frequently meet in the present day? What were the discourses of Whitefield, of Nettleton and Griffin, and what were the effects they produced? They were so many grappling-irons, which laid hold of rebels against God, and would not let them go till they were brought into submission to the high government of heaven.

We are quite prepared to be told that the character of the present age is very different from the past; that education has improved society; that philosophy has made grand developments, and therefore, that preaching should now change its character. Now, all this, whether so intended or not, is a libel on that volume which is meant for mankind in every age and in every condition. Men are yet sinners, equal in their depravity to sinners in every former period, and exposed to the same divine displeasure; without regeneration and repentance, they must be forever lost. While men are in rebellion against God, we must seek to convince them of sin, and so long as they must believe in Christ or perish, they should be told so, and that in the plainest and most forcible manner. Did the Lord Jesus, the infallible teacher, hesitate to preach the sovereignty of God at Nazareth, even when he knew it would exasperate his hearers, and lead them to attempt his death? And every reader knows that this was but one instance out of a thousand, when the great Teacher thus taught, and was thus treated. And who are we, that we should preach differently from him, or that we should expect better treatment? Even thus was it with the apostles of Christ. They neither sought to hide the offense of the cross, nor were they unwilling that their hearers should make manifest the depravity common to all men. Nay, they never studied soft words or polished phrases. If Peter has to preach to the Jews on the death of Messiah, he even selects the most offensive phrase to describe it—"whom ye slew and *hanged on a tree*;" and if Paul addresses the Gentiles at Galatia, or in the highly polished city of Corinth, it is "*the cross*," which he keeps prominently before them, and which forms the only subject in which he glories.

But this charge of men being offended with the plain statement of the most prominent truths of the gospel, is, to a great extent, a libel against society. It is true, that many, when

they hear these things, and are "convicted in themselves," are "exceeding mad." This, however, is a hopeful sign. It is the very effect which the gospel is intended to produce, and in multitudes of cases it ultimately leads the sinner to Christ for mercy. The greater part of the community will soon learn to admire the bold, uncompromising preacher. Look at the crowds which attended the preaching of John Baptist and of the Messiah, and, to come to later days, of Whitefield, of Rowland Hill, and of Griffin. The fidelity, earnestness and holy love of such men will always command attention and admiration, while nine-tenths of their hearers are compelled to acknowledge of their preaching, "it is all true." Let us, then, in this day of boasted liberality, have all the doctrines of Christianity boldly and energetically preached. For,

2. *Thus alone can the Church of Christ be perpetuated in the world.* The church is, by its great Founder, constituted "the pillar and ground of truth;" it is made to rest on the doctrines "of apostles and prophets;" its members are all drawn into it by the instrumentality of believing the truth, and are constrained to love each other for the truth's sake which dwelleth in them. Where sound truth dwells in the church, and is distinctly enunciated, the trumpet "giving a certain sound," all around the spot is blessed, but when the peculiarities of the gospel are avoided, or wrapt up in indistinct and soft phrases, so that the naked sword is sheathed, though it may be in silk, the power is gone, the spirit of God withdraws and Ichabod is written on the door of the church. Can any man look at very many of the old Presbyterian churches of England, or on many, alas, of the New England churches, without distinctly reading this? And we have read the signs of the times during the last twenty years, in both countries, with mistaken sight, if there have not been seen some of these sad indications. We see, however, or think we see, some evidences of a better state of things, because not a few of our churches are demanding more doctrinal instruction from the pulpit. Happy indeed, if we can contribute, however small the contribution, to this blessed consummation.

Still, we are not free from danger. We have among us "idle shepherds," and "sheep with itching ears," who love soft, tinkling, drowsy sounds. We have studied phrases frequently meeting our ears, which mean just what we please; we have those who preach "peace, peace," to the men with whom God is offended, and who lull those to rest who ought to be urged to "flee from the wrath to come." We have pastors frequently changing their "locations," either because

they have not boldness plainly to preach the whole truth, or because a few fashionable, loose professors of religion will not hear it. What shall be done, and where shall we find a remedy for the evil? It is at hand. Let every minister called of God, shun not to declare the whole counsel of God; let them keep back nothing that is profitable to their hearers; and let all Christians pray fervently for their pastors, that God would open unto them a door of utterance to speak the mystery of Christ, and that they may make it manifest, as they ought to speak: let this be done, and the great Head of the church will not allow his people to be disappointed, even of their highest expectations.

But if we resolve to rest in our present condition, and to choose milk instead of meat—if we are satisfied with the elegance of the pulpit without its power—if we admire the beauty of the drapery of our sanctuary windows, and are content with the exclusion of the light, then must we go on, lean, feeble and incapable of running in the ways of God without weariness, or of discharging any duty which calls for self-denial, or of effectually opposing any enemy of the great Shepherd and his flock, who enters the fold with mischievous intentions. If we refuse strong, spiritual meat, then must our missionary and other societies continue to be sustained by occasional spasmodic efforts, our pulpits must gradually lose their occupants, the millions annually added to the population of our country must perish without an effort to save them, and the ways of Zion must mourn because few attend on her solemn assemblies. Christians, are you prepared for all this? If not, rouse your energies, partake of the substantial food which your heavenly Father places before you, and go forth strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might, to the discharge of the duties to which you are called.

We have wandered from the straight line we intended to pursue when we began these remarks, and find that we have not room to make the appeal as we intended, to history, which would prove that the times of holy refreshing have been those when personal religion, sustained by doctrinal preaching, has made individual Christians strong and active.

We will, however, briefly say,

3. *That by doctrinal preaching alone can the reformation of the world be advanced.* We are aware that this is a vast field for discussion, and that some, perhaps, will be ready to withstand this doctrine; for not a few have so neglected their duty, as scarcely to know how to use their weapons; and farther, that others are not unwilling to subscribe to the doctrine that the Gospel has not power to reform the world, so



that moral reforms must be brought about in some other way. Still, however, we know what we affirm; we have tried our weapons and know their character. Let men who know not the gospel, say what they may, it is still the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Those who have not confidence in the gospel, or who never, with their whole might, have wielded this sword, are not qualified to bear testimony as to its efficiency. This, and this only, has been found to restrain sin, and to advance holiness and happiness. The grand cardinal doctrine of justification by faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, has been the great source of the freedom and happiness of the world; nor has any country on earth ever enjoyed these high blessings where this doctrine has not been prominently kept before the public mind. The philosophy as well as the history of this fact are very obvious, so that we just now prefer to leave the subject to the serious examination of the reader, rather than discuss it. Luther, better than any other man since the days of the apostles, understood it, and acted upon it; hence the glorious triumphs which, directly and indirectly, he has accomplished. Jonathan Edwards understood it, as may be clearly seen in all the productions of his pen. By this doctrine, and its kindred truths, did he perform his work. The same may be said of Whitefield, of Fuller, and of Nettleton. Thus did the first of these illustrious men change the character and the condition of the Kingswood colliers; thus did Fuller revolutionize the Baptist churches of England, and cause them to feel their solemn responsibility to the world; and thus did Nettleton apply the strongest doctrines of Calvinism to the consciences of sinners. Our space will not allow us to show how Calvin and Wickliffe, Latimer and a thousand others, have thus successfully wielded the sword of the Spirit, and how the success of every faithful missionary has thus been brought about. We are hopeful that the testimony borne by Dr. Dixon, an eminent English Methodist clergyman, is more applicable to the churches of Great Britain than to those of the United States. He says, "a diluted theology is taking the place of the good old Puritanism of times of yore, and *lean pastors make lean flocks*." Nothing can be more true than the statement in the last part of the sentence; the former, we hope, will not prove entirely correct as to American Christians; albeit we have had a very narrow escape. If in any instance among our clerical brethren, there has been a disposition toward compromise and accommodation, we beg to remind them of the statement of an eminent deceased prelate, "If it be a part of unerring wisdom, that Christian doc-

trine should have an important, an increasing, and at last, an universally pervading effect on the condition of mankind, it must be accomplished by something inherent to the system, and of which it can not be deprived without its ceasing to be the contemplated instrument in the divine hand."

We briefly touch at what we believe to be another great truth.

4. *That by doctrinal preaching the churches of Christ can alone be secured from the introduction of the most dangerous errors.* So thought the inspired preachers and writers; hence they made doctrines and duties inseparable. If they preached doctrines, they always did so with a view to their influence on Christian duties, and when they urged the precepts of religion, they did so by presenting motives derived from its doctrines.

That doctrinal truth is essential to the advancement of religion, will be strikingly apparent to our readers if they will carefully look at the connections in which the inspired writers place those doctrines. We can only just indicate what we mean by referring to an instance or two. Paul was encouraged to continue his labors at Corinth, by the divine intimation, "I have much people in this city;" and this doctrine, or rather fact of election, is elsewhere used, to excite the gratitude of Christians, and to illustrate the exceeding greatness of the divine love. Divine sovereignty is inculcated in the sacred volume to humble man, and to compel the sinner to submit to the divine government; the influences of the Holy Spirit are insisted on to encourage us to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling;" and so every other doctrine is practically taught; nor can practical religion be sustained if we seek to place it on any other basis. It would be well that each of our readers should, in this view, again peruse the masterly production of Andrew Fuller, "The Calvinistic and Socinian systems examined and compared, as to their moral tendency," a work which admirably carries out the doctrines of Scripture to their practical results.

In this connection, we may ask our readers carefully to study the history of the errors which have so terribly afflicted the church of Christ, obscuring its glory, and depriving it of its power. Would *Popery*, either in its proper form, or in its modern shape of Puseyism, ever have made such havoc in the world if the doctrine of justification by faith had always been made as prominent as it ought to have been? Would the system we call *Campbellism* have ravaged our churches in the South and West, if the doctrine of divine influence, in all its scriptural aspects had been fully presented to our hear-

ers? And would *Millerism*, so called, have distracted our churches, and effected so much mischief, if we had frequently and intelligently preached on the ultimate triumph of Christ in subduing the world to himself? Let us then, reverend and honored brethren, commence our ministry anew, and taking our stand on the sacred volume, examine its doctrines in their import, their harmony, and their influence. Let all men see that we fulfill our mission by declaring the whole counsel of God, and that we act altogether independently of them, being only anxious to please our great Master.

We close what we have to say on this important topic in the language of a recent English writer. "*We*, at least, have made up our minds to cling to the old banner of the cross; expecting, that since Jesus has already shaken the world by his accents, as no man ever did, he has only to speak 'once more,' at his own time, and in the language of the 'two-edged sword,' which issues from his glorified lips—to revolutionize society, to purify the threshing-floor of his church, and to introduce the milder day, for which, in all dialects, and in all ages, the true, the noble, the gifted, and the pious, have been breathing their prayers." B—r.

---

#### ART. VI.—DANIEL WEBSTER.

1. *The Works of Daniel Webster*. 6 vols. Boston: Little & Brown.
2. *Daniel Webster and his Cotemporaries*. By C. W. MARCH. New York: C. Scribner.
3. *The Life of Daniel Webster*: A Sermon preached at the Melodeon, in Boston, Sunday morning, October 31, 1852. By THEODORE PARKER.

No country has produced a larger number of valuable contributions to the science of politics and government, during the last three-quarters of a century, than the United States of America. Whatever may be said of our country's productions, in other branches of literature, the works of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Morris, Hamilton, Madison, Adams, Jay, and others, whose voluminous writings have been given to the world, or are now in progress of publication, have justly entitled us to honorable distinction, if not to preëminence, in this department of literature. These men are, confessedly, among the great lights of political wisdom. No country can



present names of brighter luster than those which thus cluster in our revolutionary constellation. And since their day a crowd of statesmen and orators have risen in our midst, whom we may present to the world as inheriting the wisdom, as well as sharing the glory of the fathers.

It is not necessary to look far for the causes which have produced such a development of the political resources of our people. The nature of our government, the freedom of our institutions, the circumstances and the training of our people, have all conspired to produce this result. But lying back of all these things, there are certain normal tendencies and aptitudes pertaining to the race from which we have sprung, which not only account for, but in a manner necessitate, such developments as the political history and literature of our country present. Indeed, politics constitute the great element of the Anglo-American race, as much as the fine arts do that of the Italians. Every man born and reared on our soil, is well informed in reference to the nature, tenure, and objects of just and well-ordered government. Every hamlet and neighborhood have their facilities for educating their members in this important branch of human knowledge. Thus the impulse to political speculations is always active; and the same tendency to which they owe their origin, secures their preservation. Hence the ample collections of the political writings of the statesmen of the Revolutionary Era. We can but regard this as an augury of the stable character of our institutions, and as a pledge of the preservation of our blessings. The people will not let the lessons and influence of their political teachers and guides die. What they have thought, and said, and written, remains, and must remain. And in every exigency of the country, the words of the men who "being dead yet speak," are appealed to for the arbitrament of pending difficulties, and for the settlement of future plans. And among the collections of this description which have been given to the world, of late years, in a permanent form, few are more worthy of attention than the one whose title we have placed at the head of this article.

The name of Daniel Webster has long been a household word among the people whose annals have been adorned by his genius and enriched by the fruits of his wisdom. That name would, under any circumstances, be a sufficient passport for these beautiful and substantial volumes. No man who has been in the habit of reading the best productions of the English language, during the last thirty years, whether he be a dweller in the old world or in the new, will need to

be informed as to the intellectual grade of Daniel Webster, and the characteristics of his literary performances. Both are preëminent. But the recent death of the illustrious author—the sudden withdrawal of that great light from the admiring eyes of his countrymen, will tend to invest these noble memorials of his genius and patriotism, with a fresher and more sacred interest. The issuing of these volumes from the press, may be said to have been among the last objects which engaged the care of the departed statesman. They may be regarded, therefore, in a manner, as his dying words to his countrymen. It can but be esteemed as a fortunate circumstance that this collection of the orations and papers of the great statesman and diplomatist was made in his lifetime, and under his supervision. For notwithstanding the editors assume the sole responsibility, both for what has been selected and omitted in the publication, it can hardly be supposed that they labored under any serious doubt as to the selections the author would have been likely to make, had the labor of collecting and preparing his works for the press, devolved on himself. Besides, had any of the selections made by his editors been unimportant, or objectionable, in his estimation, he doubtless would not have hesitated to have procured their omission. It is fair to presume, therefore, that these volumes present the great senator and jurist before us as he desired to be known to the world. And on the whole, we think that the reputation which the living Daniel Webster enjoyed with his countrymen, will not materially diminish so long as these volumes of his speeches and state papers shall be read. We can not agree with Mr. Theodore Parker, in the remark contained in the sermon whose title stands at the head of this article, that he has left no adequate memorials of his intellectual power behind him. It is a matter of surprise to us that so acute and intelligent an observer, with the works of Mr. Webster before him, and with his history learned by heart, could make such a statement. He must have forgotten Plymouth, and Bunker Hill, and Faneuil Hall. He must have forgotten that noble defense of the Greek Revolution, which electrified his countrymen, and sent consternation to the very heart of despotism, nearly thirty years ago. He must have forgotten that splendid effort, in the United States Senate, in vindication of the federal prerogatives, and its wonderful influence on the opinions of the people, and the destinies of the government. We are inclined to the conviction that posterity, instead of searching in vain for the qualities which rendered Mr. Webster distinguished among his cotemporaries, will rather find

occasion for surprise that he was so little known by the men among whom he lived, and that he was so inadequately appreciated by the country to whose interests and honor he devoted, for so many years, the vast and undivided energies of his transcendent mind. The numerous and by no means slight failings of the man, will then have been covered with a generous oblivion. The prejudices which have prevented the general recognition of many of his noblest traits, will then have subsided. The voice of slander and vituperation, which has been poured upon him without stint, will then have been hushed. The local interests, the petty passions, and the insatiate malice, which have conspired to obscure his merits, and malign his name, will then have been forgotten. The lapse of time will dissipate every thing but those qualities of the statesman, and those virtues of the man, which entitle him to the glory of a remembrance by his country and his race. Then will Daniel Webster stand before the world invested with all the radiance of his regal intellect, challenging the homage of men by the greatness of his human attributes, and receiving their gratitude for the beneficence of his principles and acts. Not, indeed, that all his principles will be likely to find acceptance with the masses of the coming time, nor that all his political acts will meet with a general approval; but that circumstances which press too closely upon us now, and which, at any remove of time, may still be uninviting, will then be reduced to less engrossing proportions, and be measurably forgotten in the presence of other and more congenial passages of his public life.

But that time is not yet. If Mr. Webster were not too great an object to be seen aright in the confusing proximity of our times, there are still other circumstances which would prevent him from being either appreciated or understood. The events which have incurred the disapprobation of so many of his former friends, are too recent to be forgotten. The memory of these most obnoxious acts of his long political career, is too fresh to admit of an impartial estimate of his character, and of a generous judgment of the motives which influenced his course. As a proof of this, we need only instance the bold and able, but, in our judgment, too severe critique on his public life and character, by Mr. Parker. That a man of large soul, and liberal sentiments, and generous feelings, could write and preach and publish such an estimate of Mr. Webster's character and acts, as the recent extraordinary sermon of this gentleman contains, is evidence enough that the tens of thousands whom the later public measures of the great statesman offended and arrayed against



himself, are not yet qualified to treat his motives with any excess of candor, to say nothing of charity. Let them not, however, be judged too severely for their disloyalty to his memory. We may find occasion before we conclude this article, to be forbearing in our opinion of their position; while we shall seek to find reasons for the abatement of that abhorrence with which they have regarded certain passages in his recent public doings. Nothing is more natural or common than for us to judge our public men from our own standpoint, without thinking how their conduct would appear if seen from theirs, and in the light of their larger and more satisfactory knowledge of all the attending circumstances. It is manifestly a duty, not only to put ourselves fully in possession of the views of our statesmen, but, if possible, to gain a knowledge of their position, and of the great aims which govern them. It is partly with a view of performing this obvious duty to the memory of a great man, but chiefly to develop those moral lessons which his life and death are so well adapted to impress on the minds and consciences of men, that we purpose to give a brief outline of Mr. Webster's life, his public services, and his religious views and character. We shall endeavor to remember that we are Christian Reviewers, not only in the principles which we avow, but also in the spirit which we exhibit.

Daniel Webster was born in Salisbury, New Hampshire, on the 18th of January, 1782. So all his biographers write, and then pass on; as if their only business were to give us this information about the time and place when and where the great man first opened his eyes on that world upon whose theater he afterward played so great a part. But there is in this simple statement something more than the bare record seem at first to suggest. There is something in that place on the confines of the early civilization of the New World—something in that date, the last year of that "agony of glory," the struggle of an oppressed, but resolute people for freedom—pregnant with the influences which were to give shape and color to the feelings, aspirations, opinions, and character of the future man.

The influence of external nature on character; the connection between the natural scenery amidst which a man is reared, and the tenor and tone of his thoughts and feelings; is generally admitted, even by those who have never taken pains to investigate the philosophy from which it springs. It was here in Salisbury, amidst this grand, and wild, and rugged New Hampshire scenery, of seventy years ago, that the character of Daniel Webster commenced the process of

its formation. Here was "the forest primeval," with its stately old trees, which had stood for ages smiling in the sunshine, waving gentle salvos to the wooing breeze, or shaking their jagged fronts in defiance to the raging storm. Here were the lofty hills, which reared their glorious summits far above, standing like sentinels to guard nature's magnificent repose. Here was the river, now gliding musically along in the placid course of its accustomed channel, and now, swollen by the descending torrents of the hills, bursting from its narrow bounds, and pouring its angry and desolating floods over the entire valley through which it flows. Here was the broad but undulating landscape, with its gentle acclivities, its bold projections, and its deep ravines; with its forest and field, exhibiting at one glance the majestic waste of nature and the fruitful culture of man. Here too, were to be witnessed the primeval appendages of the seasons—the sweetest balm and budding of the Spring—the most beautiful flowering of the Summer—the luxuriant fruitfulness and the dreary decay of Autumn, and the unbroken gloom and desolating rigors of Winter. And here, too, the elements found room to disport themselves in a place congenial. The lightnings glared on forest and field, and the thunders rolled their mighty diapason to the shrill voices of the tempest, as it spread itself over hill, and river, and valley. What glimpses do these things afford us of the *genius loci* which exerted its plastic power on the forming soul of the young Daniel Webster! How well adapted were such scenes to expand the conceptions of that large-brained boy, and stamp the impress of a "Miltonic grandeur" on the embryo man!

Nor could the spirit of the time, as modified by the circumstances and tastes of his family and neighborhood, have been without its influence upon the ardent mind of the sensitive and intelligent child. His first impressions of his country must have been of its recent struggle, and its newly acquired freedom. His father, and many of his nearest neighbors, had been actively engaged in the great contest for Independence. He would naturally imbibe the spirit of Stark, whom he speaks, in later life, of having frequently met, of Sullivan, of Weare, and of his own brave and patriotic father. What more natural than that the youthful Daniel should look with pride upon the triumph which had crowned the heroic endeavors of his kinsmen and neighbors for liberty, and that he should emulate their love of country, if he might not imitate their prowess. How easy to trace here the source of that devotion to his country, its interest and glory, which assumed

in him the fervor of a passion, and the steadiness of an instinct.

But we should lose sight of the mightiest inspiration of the time whose passage bounded the period of his childhood and youth, if we were to omit the religious character of his family, and the Puritan strictness of the institutions under which he was reared. Daniel Webster's mother, a woman of strong mind and a masculine force of character, was a Christian. Thoroughly impressed with the truths of Christianity, and deeply imbued with its spirit, her first care was to instruct her children in those duties and relations which are never understood except in the light which is shed on them by the Gospel. He was taught that the fear of the Lord is the only beginning of true wisdom. He was taught to read and reverence the Bible as the word of the living God. He was taught to love the church of his fathers, and to respect its ministry. And that true mother, as she taught him these things, and heard him lisp his catechism, and con his child's prayer, instilled into his young heart those gentle virtues which religion breathes, and of which woman is at once the aptest scholar and the readiest teacher. And the boy grew not only in stature, but in all sweet domestic virtues, honoring father and mother, and loving brothers and sisters, with a hearty and earnest affection. The savor of these beautiful home virtues followed the man through life, and spread its sweetness around the tomb where his weary frame and shattered hopes at last repose.

The early education of Daniel Webster was such as the common schools of New England afforded in that comparatively primitive age. It had long before been ordered by the provincial courts of the respective colonies, that every community of fifty persons should support a school for the instruction of the young in reading, writing, and kindred branches, and that every society of a hundred persons should maintain a grammar-school.\* The system of education which the New England fathers so wisely ordained, recognized, to the fullest extent, the necessity of religious culture; thus making provision for the moral as well as the intellectual training of the young. Indeed, one of the strongest reasons which they offered for the establishment of those schools was, that the young might be able to read the Bible, and thus become furnished against the seductions of Satan. It was in such a school, that the lad Daniel Webster became a pupil. As soon as he had learned to read he evinced a great fond-

---

\* Grahame's Col. Hist., vol. i., p. 290.



ness for books, and in the absence of a variety, he would read the same book over and over, until he would nearly commit its contents to memory. Mr. March, in his interesting memorials of the great statesman, relates that he learned Pope's *Essay on Man* by heart, together with many of Dr. Watts' Hymns. He never cared much for such sports as boys commonly delight in. He was a weak-bodied, thoughtful boy, serious beyond his years, and exceedingly fond of devotional poetry, and the Psalms and book of Job. Probably the greatest temporal benefit he derived from his early school life, was the strength which his physical system acquired by the walk of two or three miles a day, through the bracing air of his native hills, which was necessary in order to reach the school.

As a result of the careful home culture which the youth of the future statesman received, he was brought to realize, at an early age, the necessity of personal religion, and, while yet a youth, became a member of the orthodox church in which his parents, and several other members of his family, were communicants. Those who understand the strength and permanence of sentiments fixed in the souls of the young, will be able from this view of Mr. Webster's early discipline, to appreciate the satisfaction which he expressed at the opportunity afforded him of defending the Christian church and ministry against their enemies, in his magnificent argument before the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Girard Will case. They will be able also to see why he cherished such a regard for the Word of Inspiration, and held it so firmly as the only basis of real virtue, and as embodying the sole elements of public and private weal. And however this early influence may have been overlaid through the force of passion, or the turbulence of ambition, it never could be utterly obliterated. This were to have changed the entire nature of the man.

The first suggestion of giving the inquiring youth a better opportunity for the improvement of his mind than the common school afforded, was prompted, we believe, as much by the physical weakness under which he suffered, as by any intellectual precocity which he manifested. It was chiefly under the apprehension that he never would be able to undergo the wear and fatigue of manual labor, that his father resolved to give him an education. If the youthful Daniel had possessed the robustness which characterized his maturer years, the world would probably never have heard his name. In pursuance of the new resolution respecting his destination, he was, at the age of fourteen, placed at the Phillips Academy, at Exeter, then under the charge of Dr. B. Abbot. Here

he learned rapidly the tasks which were allotted him. His success in mastering algebra is specially noticed by his biographers. But the most remarkable thing connected with his relations to this academy was, that the future orator could not, with all his efforts, pronounce a declamation. He committed many pieces to memory, and frequently made the attempt, but was as frequently obliged to abandon it. He declared long afterward, that he "could not command sufficient resolution" to do it. It was as much impossible as it was for him to hang a scythe. What assiduity and perseverance it must have required in the future orator and farmer, to overcome these impediments to the prosecution of his two great callings. The world knows the sequel.

Mr. Webster entered the Freshman class of Dartmouth College, in August, 1797, and was graduated in the same month, 1801. While in college, he was distinguished by the same facility of learning which he had formerly evinced. The only note-worthy events which took place here, were the delivery of an oration, before the citizens of Hanover, on the 4th of July, 1800, and an eulogy which he pronounced on one of his class-mates, who died in college. For both these services he was selected by his class-mates, a circumstance which indicates the high estimation in which they held him. His Fourth of July oration we have read. It is characterized by sound views, and that profound patriotism for which its author has always been celebrated. As the production of a youth seventeen years of age, it is, on the whole, respectable. The eulogy enjoyed a higher reputation than the oration. Those who listened to it, pronounced it a production of rare merit and effectiveness.

After leaving college, Mr. Webster commenced the study of the law. We can not follow him through all the variety of struggles and changes which marked this part of his career. We can only say that, after overcoming numerous difficulties, and undergoing hardships before which a less resolute will would have quailed, he was admitted, in 1805, to practice in the Boston Court of Common Pleas. He soon after returned to his native State, and set up the practice of his profession in Boscawen. In 1807, he relinquished his office in the latter place to his brother Ezekiel, who had graduated from Dartmouth, and completed his legal studies chiefly through his instrumentality, and established a new office in Portsmouth. This year he was admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of New Hampshire. He was married the following year, to Miss Grace Fletcher, a lovely and amiable woman, who became the mother of his children, and the

idol of his domestic affections. After a highly successful practice of his profession in Portsmouth, for the space of six years, he was, when about thirty years of age, returned to the House of Representatives of the United States. He entered Congress for the first time, in 1813. The House at that time contained such men as Clay, Calhoun, Forsyth, Grundy and others, of more or less note, and we may well suppose that the new member from New Hampshire felt the responsibility, as well as the honor, of being associated with these master-spirits of the country. Nor did he prove himself beneath the noble companionship in which his constituents had placed him. His first speech in the House, which was delivered on the 10th of June, 1813, though opposed to the policy of a majority of that body, commanded marked attention from all parties, and gave the orator a standing at once among the ablest men in Congress. After serving two terms as member of Congress from his native State, he declined a reelection, and removed to Boston for the purpose of resuming the practice of his profession. While here, he was frequently solicited by leading men in Boston, who had measured his strength and admired his course during his former service in Congress, to suffer his name to be placed before the electors of the city, for that position. He, however, refused all applications of this sort, until the autumn of 1822, when he reluctantly consented to stand as a candidate, and was returned to Congress by a large majority. The circumstances to which we have thus briefly alluded, show conclusively, that whatever might have been true in later years, love of office was not a ruling passion with Mr. Webster in the earlier part of his career. From this time up to the period of his lamented death, the favorite son of New England remained, with unimportant intermissions, a member of the national councils, either in Congress, or in the Cabinet; and it is not too much to say that, in both positions, he has done honor to himself, and reflected glory upon his country.

We can not attempt to detail the numerous incidents of Mr. Webster's long public career. We have dwelt at greater length upon the circumstances of his early struggles and successes, for the double reason that they are less generally understood than his later life, and that they give us the clearest insight into the nature of the man, and the spirit with which he was animated. These early struggles and trials contributed more, perhaps, than anything else, to the compactness and massiveness of his future character. It is easy, in view of these scenes, to see how he acquired the nerve to breast



so many storms with the hardihood and unruffled composure which were among the most remarkable characteristics of his senatorial career. There are many scenes in his congressional achievements, which invite us to pause, but we are warned by our diminishing space, not to yield to the temptation. His brilliant and profound speeches on a legal currency, on the tariff, and in behalf of struggling Greece, must be passed by, with this simple mention. Nor can we linger to contemplate that grand struggle in the Senate of the United States, which has shed such a luster on the annals of American eloquence, and consigned the name of the master-spirit of the scene to posterity, as one of the greatest orators of ancient or modern times. Nor are we allowed to dwell on the celebrated constitutional debate between the two greatest minds which this country has ever produced—Webster and Calhoun. The reader who feels desirous of studying these interesting events, will find a very graphic and lifelike account of them in Mr. March's delightful book, to which we have before alluded in the course of this article. The author has the faculty of investing his record with the interest of life itself, and brings before the mind of the reader the alternately expectant and admiring crowd, the majestic form, the glowing eye, the kindling features and the thundering voice of the great orator, as his stinging sarcasm, or masterly repartee, or awful eloquence, send consternation to his adversaries, and a thrill of triumph to the bosoms of his friends. Those who do not know the crowding incidents of Mr. Webster's later public life by heart, will find them detailed here and elsewhere, and to such guidance we must leave them, for the purpose of directing more special attention to his character, and the motives which appear to have influenced his public action.

As to the intellectual grade of Mr. Webster, there can be no difference of opinion. Here friends and foes can cordially agree. All allow him to have been a man of wonderful intellectual breadth and power. His greatness was not factitious, but essential. He was great, not merely by the force of circumstances, but great in himself. He was not a great man because he was a great orator, nor because he was a great statesman, nor yet because he was a great lawyer. He was great in each of these departments, because he was greater as a man. No profession or station conferred dignity upon him, but the noblest profession and the highest station borrowed a character in appropriating him. Other distinguished men, when we think of them, suggest certain qualities for which they are remarkable, or some profession in

which they have become eminent; but Webster stands before our minds in a more simple light, and we think of no particular qualities or profession as limiting our notions of him, but of the amplitude and comprehensiveness of his proper manhood. We could see all this while the great man was still with us, and we realize it more fully now that he is dead. Even his severest and most un pitying censor felt that "he was immensely great"—that "there is no Daniel Webster left to die, and nature will not soon give us another such as he."\* Just in so much at least! A thousand pities that this keen, cold critic could not have evinced as much appreciation of his great subject, in other particulars. But what wonder that a man who can bring Jesus of Nazareth down to the level of Zoroaster and Socrates, should class Daniel Webster among hirelings and the vile?

It does not enter into our design, even if we had the space, to give a minute analysis of Mr. Webster's intellectual faculties, with a view of ascertaining their relative power. Undoubtedly that faculty, or rather, that combination of faculties, which we denominate the understanding—the power of searching, learning, mastering, arranging and exhibiting truth—was possessed by him in a very remarkable degree. His statement of his positions, was admitted on all hands to be most masterly. He had a way of presenting a complicated question with the clearness and simplicity of an axiom; and he would sometimes annihilate an adversary by simply making a statement of his argument. Who can ever forget the wonderful skill displayed in the statement he made of Mr. Calhoun's great argument in favor of South Carolina's right to nullify a law of Congress? The great Carolinian himself felt that that statement was little less than the demolition of his ingenious plea. It was Richter, we believe, who said of Luther, that "his words were half battles." It may be said of Webster, with equal truth, that his statements were half arguments. Nay, in many cases, his statement of his own position, was its demonstration, and his statement of an adversary's argument was its refutation. No other man of whom we have any knowledge, has been able to effect so much by a process so simple. But he was by no means dependent on this singular facility for the achievement of his ends. The power of his argumentation was equal to the clearness of his statement. It was wonderful to see the resources which he would bring to bear on a point which he

---

\* Theodore Parker.

meant to sustain. It was in his legal arguments, perhaps, that he exerted his highest powers of ratiocination. And a person who has never heard him in court can form no adequate idea of his ability in argument.

Closely allied to this all-grasping understanding, was an imagination of imperial grandeur. Fancy, he had none. His mind was not creative. But what a power of combination! And how everything he touched glowed with beauty and spirit and life. What feats more wonderful did the imagination of an orator ever achieve, than the welcome which he pronounced on Plymouth Rock, to "the future generations," or than the happy conceit by which he transmuted "a plain shaft" into "a powerful speaker," in his oration on the completion of the monument at Bunker Hill.

If we add to these qualities a depth of emotion rarely equaled, we shall arrive at the great secret of Daniel Webster's power as an orator. There are some, we know, who deny that his emotional nature was strong. But they can not have heard him in circumstances adapted to move him. Mr. March relates that a group of Massachusetts men, who were listening to his great speech in reply to Hayne, "wept like girls," when he pronounced that magnificent eulogy on their native State. A friend who was in the Senate chamber on that occasion, assured us, not long since, that during some passages of that speech, there was scarcely a dry eye in the gallery where he stood. It is hardly necessary for us to say that the power of propagating emotion like this, must, of necessity, involve the possession of it by the orator.

Among the noblest and most beautiful traits in Mr. Webster's character, were his filial piety and domestic affections. The warm love which he always bore for his parents, and the brotherly affection which he cherished for the other members of his father's household, tend to invest his character with a peculiar attractiveness. After his admission to practice at the Suffolk bar, he resigned his prospects in Boston, and settled in Boscawen, that he might be near his father in his declining years. Writing to a friend in 1846, he says: "My father died in April, 1806. I neither left him nor forsook him. My opening an office at Boscawen was that I might be near him. I closed his eyes in this very house. He died at sixty-seven years of age, after a life of exertion, toil and exposure—a private soldier, an officer, a legislator, a judge—every thing that a man could be, to whom learning never had disclosed her 'ample page.'" With what tenderness he was accustomed to speak of his childhood's home, and of its dear inmates. "I love," said he, on another occasion, "to dwell on



the tender recollections, the kindred ties, the early affections, and touching narratives and incidents, which mingle with all I know of our primitive family abode. I weep to think that none of those who inhabited it are now among the living." Speaking of his brother Ezekiel, in the letter from which we have before quoted, he said: "I saw him in his coffin—a white forehead, a tinged cheek, a complexion as clear as heavenly light. \* \* \* \* The grave has closed upon him, as it has on all my brothers and sisters. We shall all be soon together!" We can not refrain here from introducing to the notice of the reader, the following dedication of the first volume of his works, to the daughters of his brother Ezekiel, for whom he always cherished a pure and even self-sacrificing affection:

*"To my Nieces, Mrs. Alice Bridge Whipple and Mrs. Mary Ann Sanborn:*

"Many of the speeches contained in this volume were delivered and printed in the lifetime of your father, whose fraternal affection led him to speak of them with approbation. His death, which happened when he had only just passed the middle period of life, left you without a father, and me without a brother. I dedicate this volume to you, not only for the love I have for yourselves, but also as a tribute of affection to his memory, and from a desire that the name of my brother, EZEKIEL WEBSTER, may be associated with mine, so long as anything written or spoken by me shall be regarded or read."

Was the man in whose heart these sweet and holy home affections retained so large a place, profoundly mercenary and sensual? Could that breast be but a cage of vile lusts and bestial appetites? This were indeed a marvel.

The tastes of Mr. Webster were eminently simple and republican. He had no passion for ostentation and display. There was not a particle of vanity in his composition. He sought the solid, rather than the adventitious. He was fond of the farm, and of those recreations which country gentlemen of refined and cultivated minds seek. It has been said that he was ambitious of place and power. But who believes that he desired them for the sake of the eclat which they would give him? It may be that that regal soul—that mind born to rule—did feel, at times, a restlessness as out of its true position, and a longing to occupy its congenial sphere. If such a mind must rule—and such we know is the fact—why should it not desire to be in the most fitting position? Its self-consciousness must involve such a necessity. It is but the struggle of the great soul to grasp its true destiny. There is a grand significance in the remark of a brilliant but eccentric writer of the present day, that "the true king, or able-man has a divine right" to govern.\* And what can be

---

\* Carlyle's "Heroes and Hero Worship," Putnam's edition, p. 178.

more natural than for nature's real born king, the true able-man, to be conscious of himself, and feel a longing to perform his work! But aside from such views and aspirations as these, we can not find that Mr. Webster was ambitious. He did not, especially in his later years, court the cares and bustle of public life. If he endured them, it was to gratify his friends, and from a sense of duty, not from delight in them. Those who were admitted to the privacy of his thoughts assure us that he desired nothing more than the privilege of retiring forever from the scenes amid which he had passed the greater part of his laborious life. He could say with the Latin poet,

"Stet quicunque volet potens  
Aulæ culmine lubrico,  
Me dulcis saturet quies."

It is well known that he was making preparations to retire from the activities of the great world, to the quiet shades of Marshfield, to spend the remainder of his days, when death overtook him, and the more awful shades of the tomb gathered over his mortal remains.

Mr. Webster's arrangements for his funeral accorded with the view which we have given of his character. He would have none of the "pomp of wo." His wish was to be buried by his neighbors of the rural district where he resided, and in the unpretending tomb which he had built for himself, and on which he had caused a simple, white marble slab to be reared with this inscription—DANIEL WEBSTER.\* Everything that he had arranged was in such beautiful keeping, that no one could choose but feel the simple grandeur of the man. The thousands from city and country who thronged the consecrated grounds of Marshfield on the day of his interment, were attracted thither not by any anticipated parade, but by their reverence for the man, and their desire to do him honor. All were decorous, thoughtful, nay, mournful. Those thousands were inexpressibly sad that day, at the thought that the grave was about to receive "all that was mortal of Daniel Webster," and that there was none such as he left in all the land which had mourned his death.

One of the noblest characteristics of Mr. Webster, and one which claims special notice from us as Christian Reviewers,

---

\* We were forcibly reminded, on seeing this inscription, of the reply made by Mr. Calhoun, a few years ago, to a gentleman who remarked on the brevity of the inscription on Wolfe's monument, at Quebec: "Here died Wolfe victorious." "It is too long, sir, too long. It should have read, 'Here died Wolfe.' The world knows the rest."

was his profoundly religious nature. He seems to have been possessed by an all-pervading sense of God. The solemnity of his manner, the seriousness of his spirit, and the grandeur of his thought, always indicated an intense consciousness of the overshadowings of the Infinite. His soul was too colossal to be bound by the withes of Atheism. There was in his nature a necessity for belief in God. It has been well said, by some one, that his soul seemed to touch the infinite on every side. He was also a believer in Christ. To him the Son of Man was something more than a mere historical character. He fully recognized the divinity of his person, and the necessity of his atonement. He was a firm believer in the Bible. It was to him the word of God's own highest inspiration. It revealed to him the only saving knowledge of God—the only way of life and salvation. The whole weight of his great intellect has been thrown into the scale of the Christian religion. Whatever may have been his own defects of character, whatever sins may have held dominion over his soul, a denial of God, of Christ, and of the Gospel, was not among them. And great as his faults may have been, whatever guilt may have attached to his private life, he was not among those "who glory in their shame." He never defended his vices. He never even avowed them. Nor did they reach the foundations of his public virtues. No taint of them was discernible in his public measures, or his public teachings. We look in vain through all that Mr. Webster has said and written, for a sentiment tending to debauch the morality of the people, or to weaken the foundations of the public conscience. So much, at least, we may claim for his memory. All his measures recognize the absolute obligation of morality and religion, and their necessity to the happiness and prosperity of mankind. And his public teachings certainly inculcate the great truths and duties of the Christian religion. He declared on one occasion that "Justice is the great interest of man on earth."\* Standing on Plymouth Rock, he uttered these memorable words:

"Our ancestors established their system of government on morality and religious sentiment. Moral habits, they believed, can not safely be trusted on any other foundation than religious principle, nor any government be secure which is not supported by moral habits. Living under the heavenly light of revelation, they hoped to find all the social dispositions, all the duties which men owe to each other and to society, enforced and performed. Whatever makes men good Christians, makes them good citizens. Our fathers came here to enjoy their religion free and unmolested; and, at the end of two

---

\* Eulogy on Justice Story. Works, vol. ii., p. 300.



centuries, there is nothing upon which we can pronounce more confidently, nothing of which we can express a more deep and earnest conviction, than of the inestimable importance of that religion to man, both in regard to this life and to that which is to come. \* \* \* \* \*

"Let us cherish these sentiments, and extend this influence still more widely; in the full conviction that that is the happiest society which partakes in the highest degree of the mild and peaceful spirit of Christianity."\*

There are several passages in his celebrated argument in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Girard Will case, which deserve to be written in letters of gold. Mr. Girard made provision in his will for the establishment, in Philadelphia, of a college for the education of orphan male children, ordaining that no minister, or missionary, of any Christian sect, should ever be connected with it, and that no such person should ever be allowed, under any pretense, to visit the premises. He further enjoined that no religious tenets should be taught to the beneficiaries, during their connection with the institution. The reason which he offered for these remarkable provisions was, the differences which exist among religious sects. On this subject Mr. Webster says:

"But this objection to the multitude and differences of sects is but the old story, the old infidel argument. It is notorious that there are certain great religious truths which are admitted and believed by all Christians. All believe in the existence of a God. All believe in the immortality of the soul. All believe in the responsibility, in another world, for our conduct in this. All believe in the divine authority of the New Testament. \* \* \* \* \* The truth is, that those who really value Christianity, and believe in its importance, not only to the spiritual welfare of man, but to the safety and prosperity of human society, rejoice that in its revelations and its teachings there is so much which mounts above controversy, and stands on universal acknowledgment. While many things about it are disputed or are dark, they still plainly see its foundation and its main pillars; and they behold in it a sacred structure, rising up to the heavens. They wish its general principles, and all its great truths, to be spread over the whole earth. But those who do not value Christianity, nor believe in its importance to society or individuals, cavil about sects and schisms, and ring monotonous changes upon the shallow and so often refuted objections founded on alleged variety of discordant creeds and clashing doctrines."†

Never were sentiments more just and noble uttered in one of the high places of the earth! And how weighty, as well as beautiful, these passages on the religious instruction of children, and the consequences of its neglect?

"When little children were brought into the presence of the Son of God, his disciples proposed to send them away; but he said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me.' \* \* \* \* \* And that injunction is of

\* Works, vol. i., pp. 44, 48.

† Works, vol. vi., pp. 161, 163.

perpetual obligation. It addresses itself to-day with the same earnestness and the same authority which attended its first utterance to the Christian world. It is of force every where, and at all times. It extends to the ends of the earth, it will reach to the end of time, always and every where sounding in the ears of men, with an emphasis which no repetition can weaken, and with an authority which nothing can supersede. And not only my heart and my judgment, my belief and my conscience, instruct me that this great precept should be obeyed, but the idea is so sacred, the solemn thoughts connected with it so crowd upon me, that I stand and speak here in fear of being influenced by my feelings to exceed the proper line of my professional duty.\*

Alluding to Mr. Girard's prohibition of the religious instruction of the beneficiaries of his institution, he continues :

"Why, sir, it is vain to talk about the destructive tendency of such a system; to argue upon it is to insult the understanding of every man; *it is mere, sheer, low, ribald, vulgar deism and infidelity.* It opposes all that is in heaven, and all on earth that is worth being on earth. It destroys the connecting link between the creature and the Creator, it opposes that great system of universal benevolence and goodness that binds man to his Maker. No religion till he is eighteen! What would be the condition of our families, of all our children, if religious fathers and religious mothers were to teach their sons and daughters no religious tenets till they were eighteen? What would become of their morals, their character, their purity of heart and life, their hope for time and eternity? What would become of those thousand ties of sweetness, benevolence, love, and Christian feeling, that now render our young men and young maidens like comely plants growing up by a streamlet's side; the graces and the grace of opening manhood, of blossoming womanhood? What would become of all that now renders the social circle lovely and beloved? What would become of society itself? How could it exist?"†

Words like these could have been uttered only out of the depth of a profound conviction of the truth and reality of the Christian religion. Would it be saying too much to assert that they indicate a profound religious consciousness? How manifestly the thoughts of the great jurist were busy with the scenes of his childhood, and the careful religious nurture of which he was then the subject! What were those sacred, hallowed thoughts, which he feared might excite his feelings to an undue degree, but thoughts of those loving ones who reared him in the fear of God, and of those blessed truths which were early opened to his understanding, and enforced upon his youthful conscience, with all the tenderness and authority of maternal love?

Want of space compels us to omit several extracts of similar character with the foregoing, which we had marked for insertion in our pages. We will only say that these volumes abound in such passages, some of them even more marked

\* Works, vol. vi., p. 153.

† Works, vol. vi., p. 167.

than any we have cited. No man will dare to say that all this was but a mask, an assumed part. Every one who has seen Mr. Webster, and heard him, will think that these expressions are nothing less than sincere. Mr. Parker himself says, "Webster was honest in his oratory; open English, not Yankee. \* \* \* \* He laid siege to the understanding, and carried it by dint of cannonade. This was his strategy in the court-house, in the senate, and the public hall. \* \* \* \* It was the tactics of a great and honest-minded man."

Thus the great understanding of Mr. Webster stands committed in favor of the gospel. We have seen, in the former part of this article, how his heart was originally inclined to regard the Christian religion with reverence and trust; but we must not hence conclude that these sentiments were only traditional with him. He had not only been taught to respect religion, but he had deliberately acknowledged his duty to do so. Not only had he read the Bible, but he had studied it. He held its truths in his mind, not as fragmentary and disjointed particles, but as comprising a system—a whole, perfect and beautiful alike in its details and its comprehension. He found a divine verity, a glorious unity in the Christian religion; and he had long cherished the idea of writing a book in its defense. It may be that it is written. We know not as yet what treasures have been intrusted to his literary executors for the benefit of mankind.

Before concluding this article we wish, in pursuance of an intimation previously given, to devote a moment's attention to that passage in Mr. Webster's public life which has subjected him to such unsparing criticism from many of his quondam friends and admirers. We allude to his course on what are popularly known as the compromise measures of 1850. It is not our purpose to enter into the discussion of the main question involved in this vexing controversy. We have neither space nor inclination for such a task. Nor is it our intention to defend the course which Mr. Webster pursued on that occasion. We are not among the number who entered into his views, and sympathized with his measures. Still, we can see circumstances which we think relieve his course of much of the odium which has attached to it, at the North; and occupying the position we do, it may be admissible for us to suggest them.

Doubtless Mr. Webster did not act on the great questions which agitated the country, in 1850, as his cherished principles, and frequently avowed purpose, gave all men reason to think that he would. He had claimed the Wilmot proviso



as his thunder. He had declared that he would sustain it, in principle and in form. He had referred to his previously published opinions, as committing him to its support.\* He had said, in his place in the Senate, "I have made up my mind for one that, under no circumstances, will I consent to the further extension of the area of slavery in the United States, or to the further increase of slave representation in the House of Representatives."† He had quoted from his former speeches, and referred to his public acts to make assurance doubly sure. He had affected a fear that the parties opposed to him were less trustworthy on this subject than his own. He had declared, deprecatingly, that there had "for a long time been no North." But the North star had at length been discovered, and thenceforward there was to be a united North.‡ But were those promises fulfilled? Were the expectations thus raised justified, in the sequel? We think not. If Mr. Webster did not change his views on the subject in controversy, he certainly changed his tone very essentially. In his memorable speech of March 7th, 1850, he declared that he would not prohibit the introduction of slavery into our newly acquired territories, by an act of Congress. He claimed to have discovered that such an act was uncalled for; that nature had interposed an effectual barrier to the existence of slavery within said territories, and he would not "reënact the law of God." It was not necessary, and it would only "irritate" the South, and produce consequences which all good citizens can not contemplate without horror.

This was all, in the position taken in that speech, that can be regarded as new. He distinctly reaffirmed the views which he uttered at Niblo's, in 1837, in reference to the acquisition of slave territory. He declared that he "knew no change in his sentiments in that respect." He was willing—so he intimated—to pass the Wilmot proviso, if it only was necessary; but believing it to be unnecessary, and only irritating, he intended to vote against it. What he said in reference to the reclamation of fugitive slaves, by their masters, was only an expansion of what he had declared, on the same subject, in 1837. Speaking of the North then he said, "I believe it is entirely willing to fulfill all existing engagements and all existing duties; to uphold and defend the Constitution as it is established, *with whatever regrets about some provisions which it does actually contain.*" All that he

---

\* Works, vol. v., p. 349.

† *Ib.*, vol. ii., p. 437.

‡ Works, vol. v., p. 312.

proposed on this subject, in the speech under consideration, was to give the South additional facilities for the fulfillment of these "regretted provisions" of the Constitution. Mr. Webster has always held that the clause of the Constitution with reference to fugitives from service, should be carried out in the strictest faith. Personally it may have been a grief to him. Indeed, he intimates as much in the extract above quoted. But as a man, a citizen, a statesman, holding to the inviolability of compacts, he felt himself bound to see *this* executed to the letter. In this he may have been right, or he may have been wrong; we are not now assuming to say which. But this has been the position which he has occupied during his entire public career. In this particular, therefore, no change of views, or position, can be attributed to him. His only change was in reference to the expedient of applying the Wilmot proviso to the territories of Utah and New Mexico. We thought and still think he was mistaken in his action on this point, but we can be generous to his motives.

It has been supposed, and very positively asserted, that Mr. Webster changed his position on this great question, in order to secure the support of the South for the Presidency of the Union. If such was the motive which actuated him, never was expectation more signally disappointed; never was treachery to principle more fitly requited. During the fifty-three ballotings taken in the Whig National Convention, at Baltimore, for a nominee to be supported by that party, at the recent election, for the high office in question, not a solitary southern vote was cast for Daniel Webster. If such was his motive, the result points its own moral, and men of the North and of the South will do well to ponder it. But was this what prompted him to the course which he pursued? Could the Daniel Webster whose life and character we have been reviewing, have done such a thing? Could he have sacrificed his own consistency, and perjured himself, and betrayed freedom for such a reward? Can we conceive of him as such a very Judas? We can believe many hard and difficult things, but this is asking too much. If we ever had such a thought, reflection has quickly dissipated it. The idea is too improbable, nay, too monstrous to be entertained! Daniel Webster was too great a soul to sell himself for such a price. Nay, had such desires moved him, he knew that the plan he had adopted would prove abortive and useless. He knew that the South could do nothing for him without the North, and the North he had no hope of carrying with him to the extent necessary to secure such an end. His northern friends tried to dissuade him from the step before it was

taken. He knew that the members of Congress from his own Massachusetts, even, could not be relied on to sustain his course. Besides, he made no attempt to rally a party to back him in the measure upon which he had resolved to enter. He saw all the personal risks which he was about to incur, and, with a magnanimity of soul which does him honor, declared "that he had made up his mind to embark alone on what he was aware would prove a stormy sea, because, in that case, should final disaster ensue, *there would be but one life lost!*"\* Does this sound like a man who was deliberately sacrificing a principle for preferment. In its spirit, at least, it is worthy of all admiration. And how prophetic was that great soul's coming events! The sea was indeed stormy. But with what a resolute air—with what a majestic port, did that stern old pilot stand up and breast the tempest. And when that wreck which he had indicated came, and he felt that he must go down, with what grandeur did his solitary soul invest itself! How unshrinkingly did it meet the catastrophe!

We must, then, find another solution of this case; and, to our apprehension, it is at hand. Every one who has studied Mr. Webster's character, knows the intense anxiety he cherished for the perpetuation of the Federal Union. He was, perhaps, in his feelings, one of the most thoroughly *American* statesmen that this country has ever reared. His whole soul was absorbed in his love of country. And he felt that all the glory of his country would be lost, that all its rich promise would be defeated, if the Union were once broken up. At Plymouth Rock he urged his New England brethren, by all means, to perpetuate the institutions under which they lived. At Bunker Hill he dwelt on the value of the Union, and the awful consequences of its dissolution. In nearly one-half of his speeches, on national affairs, this theme is brought forward. We all know the manner in which he exerted himself from 1830 to 1833, to prevent nullification, and thus preserve the Union. Love for the Union, reverence for the Constitution, had become a kind of passion—we might almost say, a monomania—with him. His estimate of the Union and its blessings was so high, that he was ready to sacrifice almost any thing for its preservation. This was the one grand, ruling impulse of his public life. And surely such an idea was worthy of the patronage—nay, of the passionate idolatry—of that august intellect.

---

\* See Mr. Everett's Biographical sketch of Mr. Webster, contained in the first volume of his Works, p. clvii.



Now let us bear this tendency of Mr. Webster's feelings in mind, and survey the circumstances in which he found himself placed during the session of 1849-50. It was without doubt an evil day—a day of peril for the Union. The national councils were hopelessly distracted. The spirit of strife had rendered their members impotent for good, and strong only for evil. Diversities of opinion and interest, were fast producing that alienation of feeling, which, whenever it shall become mature, must result in the worst consequences to this confederacy. A wild, rampant, unreasoning spirit of disunion had taken possession of many of the leading minds in the Southern States. These men, represented by at least sixty members of Congress, boldly avowed their determination, unless the territories were left open to them, as to others, to raise the standard of revolt, and start a murderous foray against the Union. One member of the confederacy, seemingly forgetting circumstances which should have made her grateful, was breathing out threatenings against the government to whose chivalric generosity she was most deeply indebted. Now, was it probable that Mr. Webster could contemplate such a scene as this, unmoved? Would he not feel that necessity was laid upon him to seek to allay this strife? Would he not, like the Roman Curtius, leap into this yawning gulf? With our knowledge of his glorious one-idealism—the perpetuation of the Union—might we not have expected him to do just what he did? It seems to us now, one of the most natural results in the world. How true is the remark of one of his favorite poets:

“In vitium ducit culpæ fuga, si caret arte.”\*

The question whether his course was necessary, in order to allay this turmoil, is nothing one way nor the other. He thought it was necessary. And may it not, after all, have been so? Admitting that, up to the time he came forward with what he intended as a peace-offering to the southern members of the Confederacy, there existed no real danger to the Union, who can say that such danger would not have arisen had the then state of things continued for a little while longer? May not Mr. Webster's generous sacrifice of himself have achieved more for us than we have been accustomed to think? Who can say that that great mind did not more fully comprehend the difficulties attending the country, than those of us who have differed from him? Of one thing we

---

\* Horace, *Art. Poet.* 31.

are satisfied—Mr. Webster was honest. He acted from the highest motive that can influence a patriot. The more we learn of the character, aims, and spirit of the man, the more fully we are convinced that he did not intend to sacrifice a single interest of freedom, nor to tarnish, in the least, the honor of his country. If such sacrifice shall result from his course, it will only show that even he was not above the possibility of mistake. It need not necessarily signify any thing more.

But we must pause. Perhaps we have pursued this subject to an unreasonable length. Our excuse, in this case, must be a sincere desire to lessen, if only by a shade, the stain which, in the estimation of so many good men, rests on Mr. Webster's fame. Let us criticise his acts, as is our right, but let us be generous to his motives. It is time now to treat his memory with loving gentleness. We are too poor in great souls like his, to consign his name to the infamy of having sacrificed a sacred duty to the cravings of a low ambition. He has passed away from the judgments of human tribunals, but it is not too late to relieve his memory of the ungenerous censures which have been heaped upon him. He has gone to his final account. In the great assize to which he has been summoned, there can be no error. There every improper motive, as well as every unrighteous act, will meet their merited award, while innocence will be vindicated, and the stigma of every unjust imputation will be swept away.

A great life is ended. And who does not feel that its closing was worthy of the glory of its progress! All was grand, yet simple, to the last. No weak repinings at his fate, no restless glances back to life, marked the passage of that mighty soul into eternity. He had no horror for the change which he knew was inevitable, but wished to be conscious, and to know when it was passing upon him.

*"Jus hoc animi morientis habetat."\**

He did not shrink, tremblingly, from the awful ordeal, but humbly stretched forth his hand for the "rod and the staff" of man's only safe conductor through the portals of death. In reference to the future, though he exhibited none of the rapture of the saint, how redolent was his death-bed of the beautiful trust of the penitent. How child-like, yet how sublime was that dying prayer: "Heavenly Father! forgive my sins, and receive me to thyself, for Christ's sake." We know

---

\* Lucan, viii., 636.

not which was the more beautiful—the self-poise, or the simple faith, of the great man in the hour of dissolution. And who can conceive what must have been those thoughts which were grappling with the twin mysteries of “Life, life! Death, death!”\* He has passed into eternity! Its portals have closed upon him. Yet he lives! He lives in the records of his country’s glory. He lives in the hearts of his admiring countrymen. He shall live not only in the remembrance, but in the veneration of mankind. And we will cherish the belief that he lives in the land of light and glory, for which he sighed in the hours of his dreary decline. May it be found at last, that his name is not only recorded in the annals of men on earth, but that it is registered in the Lamb’s Book of Life in Heaven.

---

ART. VII.—PHILO AND HIS OPINIONS.

BY THEOPHILUS RUBINSOHN, PH. D.

Boston.

*Philonis Judæi Opera Omnia. Textus editus ad fidem optimarum editionum.* Leipsic, 1838.

THE philosophy which is developed in the works of Philo the Jew, has often been misunderstood. Some have considered it as a system that sprung up accidentally, and was modified by external circumstances; others have considered it as a mere eclectic system put together from various other systems, in such a manner as to make it appear a whole; and again, some with more propriety have thought it to be a system of the Gnostic philosophy. But we reject all these views and affirm that Philo manifestly endeavored to transcend the limits of historical Judaism, and amalgamate it with classic paganism. Philo was a Jew by birth, a resident of Alexandria in Egypt, and, perhaps a cotemporary of Jesus, highly esteemed among his countrymen. He combined intense moral and religious sentiments, with a well-trained though perhaps fanciful mind. Josephus speaks of him as “being a man of great distinction and skill in philosophy.” (Jos. Ant. xviii., c. 8, § 1.) His writings are distinguished from all other Hellenistic works for their classic style. In order that we should understand the philosophy of Philo, we must trace it back to the last stages of Grecian philosophy. Skepticism was the system that made an end to the philosophy of

---

\* A little while before he died he uttered these words in a clear, powerful voice.



the ancient Greeks. When skepticism took its rise, it appeared solely in opposition to Stoicism and Epicureanism, but it changed into a total denial of every true principle of philosophy. The proudly exalted "self" annihilated all other existence, by carrying out strictly the idea that there is nothing real except "self" which possesses only the power of denying all that does not exist within it. By this view, all true philosophizing must naturally cease, since there is no object left on which to philosophize. But the beautiful creation which the Grecian genius produced in the sphere of philosophy, could not withal be destroyed, as indeed, no production of genius in any age has perished. Hence, no system, having the elements of truth, has finally disappeared from the succession of philosophical thought; its principles have co-operated in bringing forth new intellectual life, and have found their appointed place in the great structure of modern philosophy. The history of philosophy is not a bare enumeration of the ideas which were current at different ages, but it is a living chain of ideas which are linked together according to their development, in the subsequent ages, and the whole chain would break if one link were removed. As in a living man, the same powers of life and the same pulse animate all his members, so in the history of philosophy, the same idea runs through the whole fabric. Each individual part as well as each individual system, emanates from one and the same idea; every distinct feature being only a reflection and an image from the same life.

The chain of philosophical development was indeed broken by the Greeks themselves, but philosophy made its way in another soil; it reappeared with fresh energy, in Alexandria. In that famous city, science flourished after the accession of Ptolemy to the throne. This was the scene of a new-born wisdom, which exerted an influence, powerfully felt through all ages, from its first appearance in the world. Here the elements of the Grecian and oriental philosophy were incorporated. The eastern and western manners and customs of life were blended, and the differences of intellect and thought entirely removed, in a manner unperceived by the Alexandrians themselves. A new mode of life, and the identity of Grecian and oriental philosophizing, produced a new style of genius, which again, in its turn, created a new system of philosophy. This is the Alexandrian philosophy, which is largely developed in the elaborate treatises of Philo.

In the writings of Philo, we see the complete amalgamation of Hellenism and Orientalism. Whoever reads his writings will not doubt the identity of the different elements in

his philosophy, and will also be soon convinced that the philosopher himself knew the ground which existing circumstances had placed him on, but could not perceive the natural contradiction between Judaism and Grecian philosophy. The Grecian philosophy, however, had nothing left of its pure, classic genius, but was colored by Orientalism; and the Alexandrian did not know of its Grecian origin, since he received it as a native of the East. It was also impossible for Philo and the Alexandrian Jews at large, to read the Holy Scriptures in that spirit which prevailed generally among their countrymen in Palestine. The differences between the life in Palestine and that in Alexandria, produced a new mode of expounding the Scriptures; and as the Alexandrian Jews did not understand the original Hebrew text, but read only the Greek version, they created a philosophical science of interpretation, namely, the *allegorical*. Philo considers this mode of explaining the laws of Moses and the prophets, as the natural disclosure of the meaning which the writers themselves entertained. He seems to be thoroughly convinced that his explanations of the Scriptures are alone true. And in one place (*De Mundi Opif.*) he says: "To Moses belongs this doctrine, not to me." To us, this sort of exposition seems absurd and unnatural, since it expels the plain sense to interpolate meanings which the words do not admit. While we look out for concealed mysteries, we shall very likely overlook the true and natural sense. Thus, in the writings of Philo, we find the strangest notions imaginable, which he advances with great ingenuity and skill, though himself unconscious of their absurdity. His philosophical doctrines made him believe the Scriptures must necessarily agree with his reasoning. He platonizes very often, so that it has become a proverb: either *Plato philonizes* or *Philo platonizes*.

Moses, according to our philosopher, "is the most perfect of all men that ever lived," as also "the most holy." The Mosaic law is "the most beautiful image of the polity of the universe;" hence it will last eternally, when all other laws shall have sunk into total oblivion.

The end of human life, Philo says, ought to be "to know God." (*Quod Deus Sit Immut.* 95.)

There are two ways of obtaining this knowledge, "either by inference, from the works to their author," or "by direct contemplation," wherein God himself must coöperate.

As we can not see "the sun but by the sun himself, and light by light; so no one can know God, but by the aid and assistance of God himself." (*De Præmiis Ac Pænis* M. 11, 414.) To obtain "this vision of God," we should be freed

from the ties of sensuality, and dedicate ourselves to a godly life; we should become ascetics. It appears, that Philo considered the patriarch Jacob as the type of ascetic life, which is attested by the name Israel יִשְׂרָאֵל or ὁπῶν θεόν, "seeing God." The Jewish sects of the Essenees and Therapeutes, also are the models, whom to copy, Philo earnestly recommends. The first mentioned sect he describes thus: "There is no lack in Palestine and in Syria, of practical virtuous men. Some of them are designated Essenees, on account of their holiness, and their number is about four thousand. They are truly religious; they do not bring sacrifices, but are striving to obtain a clean heart. They do not live in cities, but in the rural districts. They avoid the former that they should not be polluted from the vices therein. Their daily occupation is agriculture and mechanics; yet they do neither deal in nor make and sell any instruments which are used for waging war. They serve and assist each other. They do not treasure up money, and do not care for riches; these have no value with them; and, therefore, they do not strive to possess them. When they have sufficient to maintain themselves with frugal meals, they are then satisfied. Frugality is their only treasury. They do not trade, and, therefore, they are not subject to avarice. They all are free men and serve each other freely. They reject every kind of employment in the service of rulers, considering such service as inhuman and unjust, because the common law of nature and man objects to it. They say that nature has not created us to be nominal brothers only, but real ones; and it is only avarice that weakens the brotherly tie, changes unity and harmony into discord and strife, and disunites friends. They are engaged in the study of philosophy for the promotion of virtue, but avoid carefully all kinds of sophistry and exhibition of bombast. From natural philosophy they have chosen only those parts, which treat of creation and the Creator; they, however, entertain the idea that nature is above our comprehension. Morals are with them a daily study, in accordance with the laws of their fathers, and they hold that they could not interpret the laws without inspiration. They employ for that purpose more especially, the seventh day, which they keep holy, and do no common business in it. When they are in the temple or in the synagogue, the young men sit next to the old, and listen to their teachings. If any one recites a portion from a book, one of the scriptural interpreters expounds it, and discloses that which is symbolical in it, since they hold that the Scriptures should be interpreted figuratively. They give instruction not only in the essential



virtues, purity of manners, holiness and uprightness, but also in the art of accomplishing domestic and public business and duties. Their morals are based upon a three-fold foundation—the love of God, of virtue and our neighbors. This is the test of their actions. Chastity is the first of the virtues, which they vow to observe all their lifetime. They do not tell a lie by any means; do not swear, and take no oath. They are not nominal saints; this is attested by their renouncing all earthly goods, which the human heart desires; as, riches, honor and pleasure; at all these things they look with contempt. They lead a life of toil, but are temperate and free from common cares. They display no show; they are humane, modest, and do not deviate from their regulations, but exhibit a firm character. Their benevolence is the best demonstration of their philanthropy. Their equality and community are admirable. Their dwellings are open to any stranger of their community. None of them has a dwelling which he might call his own; but they live and eat in common with all. What any one earns daily, he puts into the common treasury for the general use. The sick are maintained from these common contributions. The youth exhibit for the aged a filial obedience and esteem, and support the gray-headed, when they are not strong enough to do without the assistance of others. Philosophy rears such heroes in virtue. This philosophy indeed, does not boast of Grecian high-sounding phrases, but can prove its excellencies by inducements to glorious acts, through which eternal freedom is obtained.” (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber.*)

Of the Therapeutes, he speaks thus: “Their great and distinguished merits deserve to be transmitted to posterity, and the honest man who esteems virtue, will rejoice to know them. Their institution or their philosophic school is sufficiently explained by its name. They call themselves Therapeutes and Therapeutrides, that is, physicians; but such they are in a higher sense of the word, because they are chiefly engaged in curing the diseases of the soul, which men contract through their evil desires; and also, because they had learned from nature and the Holy Scriptures, how to worship the only God. These Therapeutes will rise higher and higher in their contemplation of that which is divine, when all visible things will have passed away. Their institute is neither founded on tradition nor on proselyting; but on the principle inherent in man to yearn after the supernatural; or a kind of inspiration, that impels them to the vision of God for which they look. From the moment one enters their institute, he is, so to speak, dead to the world, and alive only for heaven

and immortality. They give their possessions to their children, friends or relatives. They leave father and mother, brothers, sisters and children, kindred, friends and country; they make themselves free from all these worldly ties, as they are to them of no value. They leave the towns and retire into the country, where they live in solitude, not from misanthropy, but that their manners of life should not become corrupt by the conversation with those not initiated. This order of men can be found in many parts of the countries above alluded to, and are tolerated and honored by Greeks and barbarians. They are also in many parts of Egypt, and live chiefly in the neighborhood of Alexandria. From their dwelling-places they send the ablest men as emissaries, to choose the most convenient places for settlements. They chiefly select the country round the sea '*Mæris*,' on account of its temperate climate and safe situation, as it is surrounded by villas, country seats and villages. These settlements are uncommonly productive, because they are exposed neither to great heat nor cold. Their houses are neither too near nor too remote from each other, in order that they may have some kind of conversation in their solitude, and to have immediate protection in the case of necessity. Every one of them has his own closet for prayer and devotion, which they call "*σεμνεῖον*" and "*μοναστήριον*." For these closets they have the laws and the oracles of the prophets, hymns and ascetic writings, and also scientific works. God is the only object of their worship, to whose honor they perform their duties. Their dreams, therefore, are ever of a sublime character, full of divine images, and there are many instances of dreams explaining the most difficult problems of philosophy. They pray twice a day, morning and evening. In the morning, they pray for salvation and blessings of the ensuing day, and for the illumination through the heavenly light; and in the evening, they pray for blessed assistance in their meditations in the law and ascertaining the truth in the Sanhedrim. Before their prayers, they endeavor to expel every thought of a sensual nature. The remainder of the day's time they are engaged in meditation and contemplation. As soon as the book of the sacred writers is opened, they are expounded through the assistance of the traditional philosophy, allegorically; as they hold that in the literal sense is concealed a mysterious one. They possess also, many commentaries from the authors of their society, whom they strictly follow. They write also hymns and songs for religious worship, in various meters."

"Six days they remain in their monasteries, and are engaged there in meditation. None of them can be seen. But on the seventh day they come together and sit according to their respective ages, cleanly and plainly dressed. The oldest and most learned then rises, and delivers a popular lecture in a dignified and expressive manner. They are distinguished from the sophists and orators of our time, by their instructive and useful teaching, the latter endeavoring to exhibit brilliant words and phrases. The Therapeutes teach philosophy, and by this means they cultivate the minds as well as the hearts of their hearers. When the lecturer delivers his lecture, all his hearers observe perfect silence, and only now and then, one might notice the expression of applause by an animated look of the eye or beckoning with the hand. Every one has perfect liberty to rise and to read and explain a portion of the Scriptures without restriction from the speaker. The women are not married. But their vow of chastity is voluntary, not forced, as among the Greeks. They dedicate themselves to wisdom and immortality." In the conclusion of this description, Philo adds: "Thus much of the Therapeutes, the citizens of the world and of heaven. By knowledge, they care for the salvation of their souls. Their virtue makes them friends of their Creator and Father. The reward of their virtue is the friendship of God, the most suitable one for the voluntary loss of all earthly goods, and the highest degree of bliss to which a man can attain." (*De Vita Contemplativa.*)

According to Philo, God is the primitive light, from which innumerable rays of a spiritual nature emanate. (*De Cherub.*) It is a favorite figure of Philo, to describe God as light; and it is indeed, a suitable one, on account of its purity, and its power of heat and illumination, which are its natural properties. In one place, our philosopher says: "If you hear that God has appeared to man, you must think that it happened without physical light; for through the spirit alone, the spiritual can be understood; and God is the source of the purest rays of glory, and if he appears to man, he radiates the brightest beams without shadow." (*De Nomin. Mut.*) In another passage, we meet with the following idea: "Over him, who endeavors to see God, the most pure and unmixed rays of the divine light are poured, before whose brightness the eye of the spirit is blinded." (*De Mundi Opif.*) God is styled "sun, the type or essence of all natural laws, the sun of the sun, the intelligent sun of the physical one, which brings light from the invisible source of light." (*De Vict. off.*) But all these expressions should not be taken in a literal sense. Philo



says: "Do not wonder at the principle of the allegory which compares God with the sun; this we are at liberty to do, because he is not only light but also the primitive light, and the type of all other lights, and also, because, as Moses said, 'God, like the sun, divides day and night, and light from darkness;' and finally, "because the sun reveals all hidden bodies, and God is not only the regulator but also the creator of all things which are now visible, and had once no visible existence."

God is the being who contains all things; this being he styles τόπος, *place*, or sphere, or "Place of all things." (*De Somniis*.) "God is himself *space*, which he himself fills." The Jewish Cabalists, also, speak thus: "The Holy One, blessed be his name, is the space of the universe, but the universe is not his space. All things without him are destitute and empty, hence supported alone by him. But he himself is limited by nothing, he is One and All." (*Leg. Alleg.* 1.) We see now, that the opinion of some learned men, who maintain that Philo's idea is that God is in no connexion with the world, is utterly devoid of truth. For as it is manifest in the passage we have quoted—if God fills the world with his being, which is kept alone by him, how is it imaginable that he is at the same time separate from it?

"God is absolute perfection; he is better than virtue, better than knowledge, better than goodness and beauty." (*De Mundi Opif.*) "He remains constantly the same; he is *unchangeable*." (*De Sacrif. Ab.*) "He is in unity with himself alone, and unequalled. By this perfection and eternal immutability, which are never disturbed from without, God enjoys the most perfect bliss." (*De Cherub.*) "God is free from affections and passions; nothing alters him;" he is "the only free being." Philo makes a distinction between God as an absolute being, and God, who reveals his will to men; in the former, he is *transcendental*, in the latter *immanent*. God, as transcendental, is called by Philo "ὅν," *absolute being, existence, totality of itself, the infinite fullness of the divine essence*. He is the abstract universality, that has no particularity. Self-existence is in no manner related to any existing being; it is for this reason he (Philo uses *It*) has no name: we can say nothing of absolute existence, except that it is absolute in itself, for we can not imagine limits to its generality. In one of his treatises Philo says: "Further, we maintain that it is impossible to have knowledge of this absolute Being, since self-existence is *abstraction*, that is, it has no limited or concrete existence. (*Quod Deus Sit Immut.*) To know, is to have knowledge of concrete things; what is known should be con-

crete of itself. But man's endeavors to know God's essence are of no effect; 'he only obtains the conviction of his own imperfection, and that God can not be known by him.' This idea has generally been misunderstood. Philo does not speak of an absolute impossibility of knowing God; that would be diametrically opposed to his doctrine "that the end of human life is to know God." We shall give Philo's idea of the knowledge of God in his own words. In the book *De Monarchia*, he says: "It is certainly difficult to know God; but man should not recoil from inquiry upon this subject. The philosopher should investigate, first, whether there is a God; and, secondly, what this God is. The first question is decided without much stretch of the soul; but the second may not only present great difficulties, but it will be perhaps impossible to decide respecting it. We know the artist by his works of art, the painter from his paintings, the sculptor from his sculptures, the architect from his structures, and so forth; and when we come into a city, where there are public institutions and useful regulations founded on wise laws, we infer that there must be wise governors. Similar is the conclusion we make from the great dwelling-place, the universe. If we look at the great variety of things in it, mountains, valleys, meadows, trees, woods, rivers, streams and seas; if we consider the atmosphere with its changes; the sun, moon and stars which divide the day and night; the fixed and the wandering stars, with the rest of the heavenly host, we must necessarily come to the conclusion, that all these things have an author, who also is their governor. For no work of art has ever existed without an artist, who has made it. Now, as in the world is exhibited the highest art, it follows that its author is the greatest and most perfect artist. Thus, we obtain the idea of the Deity. And now we can also inquire into the essence of the Deity, as far as our abilities and powers will enable us; for an inquiry of this nature is very difficult. But our investigation, although feeble, should not hinder us in our task, since there is no subject of which it is so important for man to be as near the truth as possible, as our knowledge of God. This subject of speculative study affords indescribable pleasure. Those who are initiated in it are, so to speak, removed from the earth and translated into higher regions; their spirit moves in the circle of the sun, views all things with unspeakable joy, and finds consolation and comfort in its results. They are not weary, but go on in their study, surmount difficulties, nor recoil from the numerous obstacles; and if they do not reach the end and gain the first prize in the contest, they are

yet rewarded, when they do not remain behind, but gain the second prize. With the images which the imagination (*φαντασία*) creates, conjecture is also combined, yet it should not deviate from the path of sound reason and from principles, which approach the truth. In our investigations of the nature of the stars, we do not leave off studying from the difficulties we have to remove and obstacles to surmount, although we shall never be able to tell what their real character is; but we go on in our studies, because they afford us pleasure. So also, we ought to continue to investigate the nature of the Deity, though it is incomprehensible to our senses; for the Deity is, and remains a worthy object of inquiry. Do we not observe the rays of the sun with the utmost attention, though we can not see into the sun itself? Moses, therefore, the hierophant and the friend of the Deity, the interpreter of the divine mysteries, prayed, 'Show me thyself,' as if he said: 'Thy being I know from the existence of the world, which teaches me to know thee, its Maker, as I know that the child has a father and a building its architect; but as I do not know thy nature, and find in the universe no explanation of it, so assist thou me, because thou alone art able to explain thyself to me; for as the light can be known only by light, so thou also canst reveal thyself only by thyself alone.' Moses was then answered: 'I praise thy thirst for knowledge, and thou art deserving it. But thy request can be granted to no mortal. Yet as much as thou art able to understand I will impart to thee; for easy as it is for me to give, it is difficult for man to receive. But as thou art my familiar friend, I shall reveal to thee as much as it is possible for thee to conceive. I shall, however, communicate to thee, that neither heaven nor earth can comprehend me, much less man. Know thyself, and do not strive after things which are above thy comprehension. Thou wilt know what is within man's reach.' Moses then repeated his request. 'I am,' he said, 'convinced that I can not obtain any clear and accurate idea of thine essence, yet I pray that thou wouldst show me thy glory by which thou art surrounded.' God rejoined: '*The glories which thou art desirous of seeing, are conceived by the eye of intellect, and not by the senses: they are like myself, invisible, and are known like myself, by the power of intuition alone.*'"

Philo says that self-existence separates in itself from its condition of abstract generality, and becomes active. This is the Logos, the divine Logos, or Logos of God. In the Logos alone, God is concrete, a living spirit, a true God. If we contemplate God according to his absolute self-existence,



"κατὰ τὸ εἶναι," he appears to be destitute of substantiality ; he is a God, speculatively. Absolute existence is only one *apotheosis* in the Godhead, but in unity with the other *apotheosis*, the Logos, by which he appears the contemplating and creating intellect, that is, the active, living One, in which everything moves. Both self-existence and the Logos are God. The Logos is not another God, but he is in the Godhead. As Philo explains the relation of the Logos to God by the figure of generation, he designates the Logos "the first-born son, πρωτογονος υἱος." In his book on "The Confusion of Languages," he says : "There is, properly speaking, only one Divine Being, though many are styled so ; but this is an abuse of the term. When the sacred writings, therefore, speak of the true God, it is said 'I am God.' The Scriptures (Septuagint) exhibit no anxiety in the choice of words, if they convey the proper idea. From other passages of the Scriptures we know that there is no *proper noun* to signify God ; we know only that he exists. It remains for man, nothing else, than to believe that there exists one God, and to keep this faith forever. It is, however, probable, that he holds converse with those spirits who serve him. And though it is not very proper to speak of God as of a man, the Scriptures, however, make use of such expressions for the sake of man. They speak of God as having hands, feet, a mouth and a voice ; and also as if he had passions, anger, wrath and vengeance ; they, too, speak of his going and coming and so forth. But here the words should not be taken into consideration. It is the sense, which is required. Now, there are men who can not believe in the existence of a God, except he be represented by some bodily shape, and they can not be led to the performance of their duties, except they see God coming and going between heaven and earth, with angry threats, just as a man would do. They must see the bows and arrows that God has prepared for their destruction ; they must hear vengeance cry with a loud voice. But those who have exact knowledge of God are 'the sons of God.' The Logos is the first-born son, who has succeeded the father after he has begotten him."

The Logos is also styled *the image of God* ; he is the image of God, as revealed ; he is the *first revelation of God's being*.

The Logos, according to Philo, is *God's intellect*, in which the ideas of all beings are living as typical images of all existing beings ; hence, the Logos is also called *the sphere of ideas, or the idea of ideas*. The universe was created in accordance with these ideas. "Since God," says Philo, "foresaw that he

could create nothing without a model, and that matter can not be made without a spiritual idea, he created a spiritual world before he made the material one, in which are just as many kinds of beings, as in the former; but we should neither say nor think that the intellectual world exists in finite space." He compares God's workmanship with that of an architect. "When an architect is going to build a city, he first reflects in his mind, what would be needed to make it perfect; he finishes his work mentally, before he carries out his design materially. So God has made the types before the material world, when it was his will to create it. Now, just as the designs of the city exist no where else than in the mind of the architect, so the intellectual world has no other place, but in the Logos, by whom it was built." If we might be allowed to use a metaphor, we should say, the intellectual world is God's reason, as the spiritual city is the reason of the architect, who designs to build a real city according to that of his reason. The Logos is, consequently, God's reason; that which thinks the universe, and apprehends every thought of the beings that are created into the world. But God is not barely (passive) thinking, but active, and indeed a creating God. He is the living and life-giving God, whose activity we see, has produced both the spiritual and material worlds.

The Logos is twofold, both in respect to the intellectual and to the material world; as to the former, he contains the spiritual types of which the intellectual world is composed; as to the latter, he contains the visible things in which there are only the images and reflections of the types. In respect to men, the Logos manifests himself also in two different manners. The one is the inward-dwelling world of ideas, the other is the active one, which acts chiefly by means of language; one is the source, the other its emanation; the one has man's spirit for its organ, the other has its organ in man's language.

The principle of the material world is negation; in other words *matter* lacks independent existence, and can only then exist, when it is pervaded by God's ideas. As God is existence in himself, so matter is non-existence in itself; and as God is the source of life, so matter is lifelessness; and if we reflect on matter without ascribing to it a distinct form, it is barely pure destitution, without substantial reality. "Moses," our philosopher says, "knew that existing beings have two different causes, one active and the other passive, and that the active cause is the purest and the brightest reason, which is preferable to virtue, knowledge, beauty and goodness; the passive—matter—is inanimate, immovable of itself; but

if animated and set in motion by God's reason, it is the most perfect work in the visible world. The source from which lifeless matter is filled with real existence, (which in itself contains no beauty, but only the capability of being beautified,) is the goodness of God, who granted existence to lifeless matter." The idea that the goodness of God is the source of the existence of the visible, material world, Philo has in common with Plato. (Comp. *Timæus*, p. 29.) The Cabalists also teach the same doctrine. The Zohar declares "that the 'En-soph' is the absolute goodness; he created the worlds, to do good."

The architect of matter is the Logos. The world has necessarily been created. The Logos is the seal by which every thing has been formed; hence all things have their perfect form from the beginning, because they are impressions of the perfect Logos. The production of shapes in matter is occasioned by the ideas of the Logos, which are imprinted in matter, which has the capacity of receiving forms, and through the Logos has the power of exhibiting them in reality. But ideas work only intensively and become a distinct, independent specimen, as a general animating power. Those men, says Philo, who deny the existence of immaterial ideas, deny also the Author of things, who is the image of all; we can not deny those ideas, if we concede form to matter. God has made use of the ideas to imprint upon matter forms and shapes. Through the activity of the ideas, the material world has its existence, which is the image of the intellectual world that lives in the Logos of God; and as God's intellectual power has created the intellectual world, so matter and the visible world at large have also been created by it. "All material things," this is the idea of our author, "must have been created, for they change, and never remain in one condition; eternity belongs only to intellectual and invisible beings; our world is visible, it must consequently have been created. But we must not say that the world was created in time, since time was not before the existence of the world; but either *with* it, or *after* it. Time is the measure of the motion of the solar system. Motion can not exist before the things that are to be set in motion, but *with* them, or *after* their creation. Time is either as old as the world itself, or younger; but it would be quite contrary to reason to say, time is older than the world. As the world can not have been created *in* time, so God did not want a certain space of time to create individual things, since it was conformable to God's power to create all things at once." The six days of which the sacred books give an account, have reference only to the rule and



order, in which created things became visible. The order of things was necessary, for there is no beauty in disorder. The universe was filled and pervaded by God's intellect, as soon as it was created, and this is also the cause of its stability. "All visible things," our philosopher says, "are loose and fluctuating in themselves, kept together only by the Logos; he is the power that animates creation." The Logos is also the law, by which every thing in the universe lives; he is also the active power that regulates and governs the laws of nature, and, therefore, he is styled *law*. This law is the most powerful support of the universe; it brings together and unites all its parts, since it reaches from its center to the utmost limits, and from the utmost limits to its center, and its course is immutable. The Creator has made his law—the Logos—the indestructible tie of the universe; the elements, therefore, can not act contrary to one another, because the law is interposed between them; hence also in the world prevails the most intimate connection. One thing has its close connection with another, like the links of a chain; every thing living for and through another, and aiding it, so that the whole appears to be an artificial organization, in which each member has its natural position for the support and the sustenance of another. "The harmony of nature is the goodness and mercy of the omnipotent God." The power of God, which we perceive in the preservation and guidance of the universe, is revealed to every observer, both in small and great things. God is also omnipresent, as his power fills the whole of the universe; no space, no spot in the world is without him; every where he appears the active, creating God; and as he manifests his power in the entire universe, so we can see this power also at every time. God never ceases to be active. For as it is the character of fire to burn, that of snow to produce cold, so is the character of God to be active. God is the active principle within every thing. Now the whole universe is filled and enlivened by God's power; hence the smallest thing in creation may be compared with the whole of the universe, because both man and the universe consist of a body and a rational soul. Man may be called the little world—(microcosm)—and the universe the great man. *Quis rer. Div. her.* From what we have advanced, (Philo adds,) "it appears, that the Logos is the universal mind, or the intellect of God, which creates, animates, pervades and preserves the whole universe."

According to Philo, the human soul is the most beautiful effulgence of God's image. In it the spirit of God is revealed in the most perfect manner. In respect to the human under-

standing, man is formed in the closest relation to the Logos. It is a part of God's intellect; hence its excellency, its ability to penetrate into every province of science and knowledge. It could not exercise such power, if it were not a part of it; and indeed it is inseparable from the intellect of God. It is inseparable, because we can not conceive separation in God. We may imagine expansion in God. The human spirit, therefore, can reflect upon the universe in all its most remote parts, without destroying itself, because its power is expansive. As God can not be divided nor separated neither in himself, nor in the natural world; since all things, both small and great, are one and the same manifestation of himself, so he is manifested in man; every individual intellect emanates from the universal one, from God. (We should remember that this is God the Logos, and not  $\delta\upsilon\iota$ .) "The spirit," Philo says, "has left the heavens, and wandered into the body, as into a foreign country. But the union with the body was necessary, as the spirit can be active only in the body." (*De Leg. All.*) The noblest and best attribute of man is his intellect; it is a part of the purest and best being; it is like God's character. Intellect is eternal. The creating Father has endowed it with liberty, free from every want; it has the same attributes with God, in respect to its power of acting spontaneously. Nothing is more godlike in the entire creation than man, and, therefore, he is styled the image of God. Man has free will to act; this is his distinguishing characteristic. He is gifted with thought and freedom, and in these his similitude to God manifests itself. By his power of thought and reflection, man is able to break through the limits of matter and become immortal. "Reflection and thought of heavenly things, lead to a happy life; philosophy is the result, and through it man, though mortal by nature, becomes immortal." The capacity of the soul to know and to understand, is the effect of the Logos of God; through him the soul has strength and nourishment. Those who asked in the wilderness, "what is it by which our soul is nourished?" found by experience, that it was the Word of God, the Logos, from whence all knowledge and wisdom flow like an inexhaustible stream. It is the heavenly food, which is meant by the words (in Scripture,) "Lo, I shall rain bread upon you from heaven;" for indeed, God rains wisdom upon the good, regenerated man, and souls who long for it.

"Do you know," Philo asks, "what the nourishment of the soul is? It is the Logos of God, which like dew fills the whole earth. But God's intellect appears to operate only where the soul is not polluted and fettered through ties of

sensuality. The Logos may be compared with the pupil of the eye. As the pupil of the eye, though minute, can survey the whole earth, the immense ocean, the broad expanse of the air and the firmament, from east to west, so the Logos is able to see every thing. The intellect of the individual man is an emanation from the first universal intellect, viz., the Logos. Human wisdom bears the same relation to God's wisdom as that of individuality to universality, or as the copy to its original.

The Logos, who is the living and acting intellect of God, is also the moral power that guides man; like a stream the Logos pours forth wisdom, to water the heavenly plants of souls which love virtue. He is also the bearer of the four cardinal virtues: *φρόνησις*, *σωφροσύνη*, *ἀνδρεία* and *δικαιοσύνη*. As the Logos is the law of the universe, which leads to eternal order and regularity, so the same is the active power of God that appoints for it existence, increase and end. Whoever lives in accordance with this law, submitting himself to the guidance of God's intellect, he is a free man. To follow God, to live and to act in God, is man's duty; this is his liberty. Man's soul is in God, hence he is free. But only then is he perfectly free, when he renounces sensuality, and finite pleasures, and lives wholly in God, who is infinite and eternal. A life like this is truly immortal; but devotion to pleasure and wickedness may be called *death*, because the spiritual power ceases and the rational soul does not manifest its life. The soul is spirit, but only then, when she subdues nature, (*De Vita M.*;) when the superiority of the soul is suppressed, the moral man then is dead.

The highest task of man is, to break through the power of sensuality and to raise himself to God. But man can not be perfectly virtuous through his finite nature; this must yield to God and be filled with his spirit.

It is the pleasure of God, says Philo, to plant virtue in the soul; but a soul is egotistical and godless, if it claim similitude and freedom of will in a degree like God himself. It is God alone, who plants and sustains the excellencies of man's soul; it is impious to say, 'I plant,' where it is God who does it. Every good action, every moral deed, has its source solely in the inward, living and acting Spirit of the Godhead; wickedness receives its life from the flesh, the finite and material creature; hence *man is apt to sin from his birth*. Man is inclined to sin inherently. The soul, however, as it came forth from God, and is penetrated by God, is free from sin and passion. If man strive to be absorbed in a godly life, and entirely renounce sensuality, he enjoys the deepest and purest



bliss. As God is beyond frailty, and free from every kind of passion, so man if he live and move in God, destroys the power of sin; he lives in eternal peace and happiness. Whoever is under the burden of sin, suffers in himself an incurable disease and ever-during misery; impelled into society of the godless, he feels eternal pain. This is not to be understood of pains in Hades, but the seat of lusts and desires for that which is wicked; the life of the godless is the real Hades. (*De Congr. Quærend.*) The life of a man who lives in such eternal pain, from unruly passions, is destroyed by intemperate sensuality, and can never have real peace; he leads a life of never-ceasing and eternal sorrow.

There are, according to Philo, three sorts of men, earthly, heavenly and godly men. Earthly men are such as delight in sensual enjoyments, and find their happiness in vain pleasures alone. Heavenly men are such as delight in science and art, for intellect is heavenly and active in heavenly things, in science and art in general. Men of God are such as are priests and prophets, partaking in nothing worldly, are above all sensual enjoyments, and live in a spiritual world. These men of God are of the highest order of men; they nourish their souls not only by science and art, but raise their entire being to the highest degree of moral perfection. They are absorbed in the region of spirit, they live in God. Yet it is not the exclusive privilege of priests and prophets to exalt themselves to that height of perfection, but every man has the capability of exercising his powers to the highest rank possible; this they can chiefly effect by means of an ascetic life. Three ways present themselves to men on which they can lead a pure, perfect and virtuous life. First, through a natural tendency of the soul, (*φύσει*,) secondly, through persevering studies, (*μαθήσει*,) and thirdly, through an ascetic life, (*ασκήσει*.) To see God is the highest perfection to which man can arrive; to be absorbed in God is the true and only perfection.

---

## ART. VIII.—JOHN S. MAGINNIS, D. D.

THE death of this eminent minister and theological instructor has already been announced to our readers through the newspaper press; but we feel that an event of such moment to our denomination, and to the cause of sacred learning, ought not to be allowed to pass without a notice in our pages. We have cherished the hope of presenting some account of Dr. Maginnis from the pen of one whose intimacy with him qualifies him to speak with more fullness and assurance than we can assume to do; but we are disappointed. Unwilling to send the *Review* to press without some mention of his lamented death, and such a notice of his life as we may be able to furnish, we have determined to attempt a brief sketch of his life and character.

We believe Professor Maginnis was a native of Ohio. Of the circumstances of his early life we know comparatively nothing. He entered Brown University in 1827, when he was about twenty-two years of age. He was distinguished, while in the university, as a close student, and it was doubtless owing to his intense application to his studies that his health failed, and he was obliged to leave before he had completed his college course. After an interval of several months, during which time his health had become somewhat recruited, he entered Newton Theological Institution, in 1828 or 1829, where he remained till he completed the course of instruction prescribed for its members. In September, 1832, he was ordained and installed as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Portland, Maine. Here he remained until his health again failed, and he relinquished his charge of the church, and shortly after, in the hope that a change of location and climate might benefit his shattered constitution, assumed the charge of the Pine Street Baptist Church in Providence, Rhode Island. He continued here till the summer or autumn of 1837, when he was called to the chair of Biblical Theology in the Literary and Theological Institution at Hamilton, (now Madison University,) which he occupied until his recent removal to Rochester, to assume the same position in the new theological school connected with the flourishing University of that city. Here he remained until Friday the 15th day of October, when his sainted spirit took

its departure, to dwell with that Saviour whom he had so long honored; and in whose atoning work he had so fully trusted. The following extract of a letter from Rochester, which we cut from one of our religious newspapers, furnishes the only account of his sickness and death which we have met. We append it because it is more satisfactory than any thing that we could supply.

"For several years he had suffered from a severe bronchial affection, and from disease of the heart. About two months since, symptoms of dropsy on the chest and of general anasarca manifested themselves and awakened the most serious apprehensions of his friends. At the commencement of the present collegiate year, Dr. Maginnis was compelled by the pressure of disease, to relinquish the recitation in Moral Philosophy, of the senior class in the University. He could not, however, consent to omit the exercises of his theological class, and continued to meet them at his own residence. A sad interest was imparted to his instructions by the apprehension that they were the last which he would ever deliver. On Tuesday, October 12th, the symptoms of his disease became more alarming, and the exercises of his class were relinquished. An increased difficulty of breathing was experienced, and it soon was evident that no hope of his recovery could be cherished. But no fears of *immediate* death were felt. On Friday, the 15th of October, while sitting in his study, having just ceased conversing with a friend who was present, he suddenly expired. He died so quietly, so free from pain, that those who were with him could hardly believe that he was no more."

Dr. Maginnis' health was ordinarily feeble, yet he continued to keep up, and to prosecute his labors. It has always been a matter of surprise to his friends that he has been able to achieve so much under circumstances so unfavorable. The mind seems never to have sympathized in the weakness of the body, but rather to have borne it up, and to have compelled its activity in spite of its infirmities.

Of Dr. Maginnis' pastoral life we know but little. We know, however, that he was an able and instructive preacher of the gospel. We have frequently listened to his clear and powerful expositions of its truths, and his solemn appeals to the consciences of men, from the pulpit. Though his manner was somewhat constrained, and, at times, monotonous, owing doubtless to the physical weakness under which he suffered, it was still stamped with such an air of earnestness and solemnity that he rarely failed to leave a deep and salutary impression on the minds of his hearers. You felt a con-



viction, while listening to him, that he both believed and felt what he was uttering. There was no ornament in his style, no attempt at piquancy of expression, no search after beautiful imagery, and rarely, if ever, an indulgence in classical allusions. No man was ever less indebted, for his distinction as a preacher, to such sources. Clear, logical, direct, his preaching was characterized by the severe symmetry and rugged proportions of truth, rather than by adventitious ornament and display. He left the hearer thinking of the truth which had been discussed, not of the graces of his style, nor of the versatile attainments of the preacher. His sermons were always carefully elaborated. We remember to have heard him express a very severe reprehension of the practice of some ministers who go into their pulpits with little, or inadequate preparation. He felt the obligation of the ambassador of God to present the messages of his Lord and Master in no crude form, but "to study to show himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." We have been informed by one who knew him well during his pastoral life, that his own practice in this respect was always in accordance with the counsel which he afterward enforced upon others. He always cherished a deep respect—perhaps we should say reverence—for the pastoral office. His manner was always deferential and respectful to the humblest members of the sacred profession. We wish that the views of pastoral dignity and authority which he cherished and inculcated were more prevalent in our denomination. Speaking on this subject, in a Review of Rev. Warham Walker's *Manual of Church Discipline*, he said—"No pastor has a right to waive or disclaim his official authority. He has no right to say to his brethren, 'I have no authority; I am as one of you.' The truth is, if he is a pastor he has authority; and if he has rightly come by his sacred office, it is an authority conferred by the Holy Ghost; and it is consistent with the most perfect humility for him to acknowledge it, and use it to the praise and glory of God's most holy name."\*

But though respected, he was never, we believe, eminently popular as a pastor and preacher. He had too little versatility of mind, too little flexibility of feeling, and a manner too rigid and unpliant to win golden opinions from the multitude, which is always taken with what is showy instead of what is substantial. It was generally conceded, by those who knew him best, that the theological lecture room was

---

\* *Christian Review*, vol. ix., p. 432.

the true theater for the exercise of his powers; and amply did his able and judicious labors in this important department justify the views of the friends who designated him for the vacant chair of Theology at Hamilton, in 1837. It is not too much to say that he stood in the first rank of theological instructors. Certainly no member of the denomination to which he belonged can be regarded as surpassing him as a professor of biblical Theology. We make this remark with a distinct apprehension of the high grade which we thus assign the deceased professor, in this department of instruction. His intellect was of a high order, and he had bestowed upon it the culture which an intense love of study, united with the incentives growing out of an official position, might have been expected to secure. He was characterized by patient and laborious research, and a sincere desire to ascertain the truth as the Bible reveals it. Creeds and formulas had little weight with him, except in so far as they were expressions of biblical truth. To a clear understanding he united great metaphysical acuteness, and an uncommon power of argumentation. With such a knowledge of his leading characteristics we are not surprised at the very flattering success which has attended his labors as a theological instructor.

In reference to the views which Dr. Maginnis inculcated in the lecture room, it is almost unnecessary to say that they were what is generally denominated strict Calvinism. He had little sympathy with the efforts, so frequently made, to modify or improve the system of the great Genevan Reformer. On this point he remarks in his review of the works of Dr. Woods, as follows: "Calvinism is never seen to better advantage than when allowed to appear in its original ruggedness. Its style is Gothic; and to fit it out with Corinthian columns would only spoil its symmetry."\* In the same article he distinctly presents Turretine as his favorite theologian, and expresses his preference not only for the methods, but likewise for the general features of that distinguished author's theological system.† On the fall of man and the consequent depravity of human nature,‡ the vicarious atonement of Christ, and the justification of believers through his imputed merit, the sovereignty of God in the election of his people, and the co-related doctrines of grace, he was distinctively and

---

\* Christian Review, vol. xvi., p. 384.

† Christian Review, vol. xvi., p. 383.

‡ To use his own words on this point, he regarded human depravity "as a sin in its own essential nature." Review of Dr. Woods, Christian Review, vol. xvi., p. 400.

rigidly Calvinistic. And to the elucidation and defense of these great doctrines he brought the rich spoils of his protracted and patient reading, and the acuteness and power of his great understanding. Long will it be ere an abler or worthier expositor of these great principles will occupy the chair which his untimely death has vacated in the institution for whose establishment he so earnestly labored, and to whose prosperity he had consecrated the energies of his life.

The character of Dr. Maginnis was very strongly marked. We have, however, no time to enter into a minute analysis of it. He exhibited profound conscientiousness, inflexible tenacity of purpose, and downright honesty of utterance. These traits sometimes made him appear unaccommodating and harsh, but to those who understood the man they never suggested the want of real kindness of heart, and native amiableness of character. Indeed few men possessed a kindlier nature. Few evinced more respect for the rights, or more regard for the feelings of others. No man of his standing was more humble in his feelings, or distrustful of himself. He regarded the apostolic injunction to esteem others better than himself. But for all this he could not be induced to give up an opinion which he had deliberately formed. Though humble and naturally amiable, he had no remarkable facility of adjusting his views and action to the opinions, prejudices and interests of others. In short, his character presented an unusual volume of compacted manliness.

His Christian character was of necessity modified by the natural attributes at which we have glanced. His piety was ardent, sincere and practical. It was this which clothed his pulpit performances with such solemnity and unction. He always spoke with peculiar interest of the time when he surrendered his soul to the will of a faithful and covenant-keeping God. We remember to have heard him repeat the words of Paul as expressive of the confidence he had continued to cherish in Christ, and his union with him—and we never can forget the emphasis with which he uttered them—"I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day." The great desire of his heart seems to have been to do the will of God, and to commend himself "to every man's conscience in the sight of God." When informed by his medical adviser, a few weeks before his death, that there was no hope of his recovery from the malady with which he was afflicted, he received the intelligence with the utmost calmness, and from that day he seemed to have no thought and



no anxiety but to make the most of his strength during his remaining days on earth, for the cause of Christ, in the preparation of the future ministers of his gospel for their work. And in spite of severe pain, to which he was constantly subject, he continued at his post until three days before his death, when, at the urgent solicitation of his friends, he consented temporarily to suspend the labors of his department. Little did he or his friends think how soon the resumption of his cherished work was to be rendered an impossibility by death. But his work was done. And God in mercy delivered him from the inactivity of a protracted confinement to the sick room, which we may well suppose his ardent soul could ill have borne, and took him, harnessed as he was for his work, to the joys of his heavenly reward.

But we are admonished that we must pause. We regret that we have not the means of making a more complete and satisfactory sketch of this good man and honored servant of Christ. Less than what we have thus placed on record we could not say; would that it were worthier of the man and of the position which he occupied. We hope yet to be able to furnish the readers of the Review with an account of Dr. Maginnis' life and character from another hand, which shall do more ample justice to the subject.

---

## ART. IX.—NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

## (1.) HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

*Lectures on Ancient History*, from the earliest times to the taking of Alexandria by Octavianus. By B. G. NIEBUHR. Translated from the German of Dr. Marcus Niebuhr, by Dr. LEONHARD SCHMITZ, F. R. S. E., &c. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea.

It would be a work of supererogation to say much of Niebuhr's character as a historian. There is nothing equivocal in the position which he occupies before the world. His historical methods have led to a complete revolution in our ideas respecting the political and social life of the classical nations of antiquity. He sustains to this department of study the same relation that Cuvier does to that of comparative anatomy. To the best qualities of a powerful intellect, he added the plodding patience of an antiquary, and the practiced acuteness of a philosopher. Distinguished even among his country's scholars, not only for his philological attainments, but for his familiarity with ancient archæology, he had access to the choicest collections of ancient manuscripts. Indeed nothing seemed to be wanting to the performance of a great work, and according to the undivided suffrages of the literary world, Niebuhr has proved himself worthy of the rare advantages thrown in his way. His success has been so signal that no one thinks of disputing his pre-eminence.

Undoubtedly any thing presenting itself under the sanction of so great a name would be eagerly sought for by persons of intellectual tastes. No emanation of such a mind would be likely to be unworthy of being read. We think we can assure the purchasers of these volumes that they will not be disappointed in the hopes they may entertain of them. They exhibit on every page the same powerful understanding, the same cautiousness of judgment, and the same boldness and acuteness of criticism which characterize his former historical works. Like his lectures on Roman history, issued in England a few years since, under the auspices of Dr. Schmitz, they are made up from the notes of the students before whom they were delivered. This course was twice delivered by Niebuhr, during his connection with the University of Bonn; first in 1826, and again in 1830. He was accustomed to speak extempore, using only brief memoranda, containing his authorities and such suggestions as he feared he might otherwise omit. The notes of the course as last delivered, have been adopted as the basis of the present work, both because they were supposed to embody the results of the lecturer's latest researches and reflections, and because they were more ample and accessible. The editors are deserving of the highest praise for the manner in which they have executed their difficult task. We venture to say that no one would have conjectured from the style and general appearance of the work that it had been

collected in such a manner. There is not only a distinctness of outline but also a fullness of detail manifested throughout, which could scarcely have been exceeded had the author himself written them out for the press. We need not say that the work of translation has been well done. Dr. Schmitz's familiarity with both languages, and his admitted ability as a man of letters, furnish an ample guaranty for this.

These volumes treat of the ancient Asiatic nations, the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Macedonians and the Carthaginians. He applies to the traditions and legends of these nations the same canons of historical criticism which made such a sifting in the annals of Rome. These are partially stated by him in the following paragraph:

"The more recent the narratives of our authorities are, the more positive is their mode of speaking; and the more ancient they are, the fuller they are of contradictions. The uniformity and harmony in the traditions of a later time are delusions, and arise from the simple fact that only one narrative has become established to the exclusion of all the others which have been suppressed. This is one of the first axioms of historical criticism. There are many *rationes* of it, but they can not be taught because they require a peculiar tact; nevertheless there are certain maxims. Another such axiom is, when history begins to be written, it commonly enlarges a great deal too much in the legendary periods; for otherwise that which lies at a distance would seem to approach too near our eyes; hence the events are separated from one another by much larger spaces of time than they actually require for their development."—*Vol. i., p. 258.*

We can not give a strict analysis of this work. Indeed the form of the work in a manner precludes this. We can not refrain, however, from making some extracts which tend to confirm the truth of the Mosaic record. It can but be regarded as a remarkable fact that Niebuhr, destitute as he was of reverence for the antique, and unsparing as he was in sifting ancient chronicles, never questions the truth of the Bible history. On the contrary, he firmly believed in its truth. He found that all that was reliable in the records of Babylon, Nineveh and Persia, tended to confirm, rather than invalidate the Mosaic records. The following extracts are important for the substantial manner in which they substantiate the Mosaic cosmogony and chronology.

"The cosmogony of the Babylonians is very remarkable: according to it the world begun with a chaotic darkness which was conceived as a fluid, and as inhabited by swimming animals of the strangest forms; some of them are described, and representations of them are said to have been preserved in the temple of Belus, at Babylon. These were the creatures preceding the last revolution of the earth. The darkness was conceived as a power controlling the chaotic confusion, and was called *Thalath*. Belus was the governor of the world, but not its creator. He separated, it is said, darkness from light, and the present atmosphere and the surface of the earth were formed. When light appeared the animals above mentioned hardened and died. In this manner the material world came into existence; but in order to infuse life and spirit into it, Belus cut off his own head, and mixed his own blood with the earth. From this mixture the first man, *Alorus*, was produced; who was succeeded by generation after generation until the flood. This period, from the creation of the human race to the flood, which entirely agrees with that of Noah, that is, the period between *Alorus* and *Xisuthrus*,



or between Adam and Noah, was computed by the Babylonians at 120 sari, or 432,000 years. This period accurately corresponds with the Kali-Yug of the Indians, except that the latter regard the age in which we live as being this period, which the Babylonians describe as a by-gone time. Attempts have been made to reconcile this period with probability; *but this is impossible*, and at the same time superfluous. Men have found a certain kind of attractive majesty in that which is monstrous.

"Man was first created at Babylon; corn grew there wild, and the new race of beings there found the first necessary food, especially wheat. This tradition is the more remarkable, because several naturalists have made the observation that corn does not grow wild in any part of the world. I do not know whether by a process of improvement our garden fruit can be derived from wild fruit; it is well known, however, that the noble vine grapes grow wild in Colchis. Whence, then, does corn come? My opinion is that God made direct provisions for man; something was given to all, real wheat to the Asiatics, and maize to the Americans. This circumstance deserves to be seriously considered; it is one of the manifest traces of the education of our race by God's direct guidance and providence. In the development of the whole human race we meet with a great many things of a similar nature, which any one must acknowledge who is not under the influence of an antipathy, a degenerate antipathy, against the belief in such a divine guidance. Among them may be mentioned the working in metal; for it could not have occurred to man had he not been guided by an instinct which does not come of itself. In like manner he can not have discovered a healing power of plants, without such an instinct. At a later period man was guided by analogy and combination, and the inward higher voice of instinct became weaker and weaker the more the reasoning powers were developed.

"When man began to live in a human way at Babylon, the cosmogony proceeds, there appeared to them from the deep one of the monsters of the preceding world, which had been saved, and with a human voice, gave them information on the events of past times. Now it is true, no man in his senses will take it to be an historical fact that God should have revealed himself in such an unworthy form; but these notions of strange and monstrous beings of the primitive world, are nevertheless highly remarkable, inasmuch as their existence is attested by the remains which geologists have discovered in secondary formations of rocks; remains of creatures which must have lived before the present solid earth was formed, and moved in chaos according to very different laws. Were there among the Babylonians geologists as at present? Did they, even then, carry their investigations into the bowels of the earth? and did they arrive at the same conclusions as those at which Cuvier, Brogniart, and others have now arrived? Or must we suppose that along with other revelations,\* they received one also concerning past times? Whatever it may have been, this notion of something fantastic in nature is highly significant; it is not an idea on which man could have fallen of himself.

"It is further stated, that the men of that period of 120 sari, lived immensely long; until there arose unjust men, and God decreed to destroy mankind on account of its increasing wickedness. He ordered one just man, Xisuthrus, to build a large ark, like that of Noah, and to embark in it with a chosen band of pious men. A flood then occurred which overwhelmed and destroyed all

---

\* Niebuhr's intimation in the expression "along with other revelations," that the Babylonians, in common with other heathen nations, enjoyed an original and full revelation from God, is in accordance with the belief of the Christian world. This is so clearly asserted by St. Paul, Romans i. 18, 25, that no Christian pretends to deny it. These important suggestions of the great historian tend to illustrate, if they do not confirm, the apostle's words.

Babylonia. The ark floated toward the mountains of Armenia, and when the waters had subsided, the just men then disembarked, and returned to Babylonia. This evidently presents a resemblance to the account of the flood of Noah, to which we may add the circumstance that the number of generations from the first man to the flood is ten, the same as that between Adam and Noah; while on the other hand, the Babylonian tradition differs from the Mosaic account, by stating that not only Xisuthrus and his family, but all pious men were saved; and also by making the flood not universal, but only partial, and confined to Babylonia. After the deluge, Babylonia became inhabited again, and we now find lists of dynasties in ever decreasing periods of time, just like the lives of the patriarchs of the Old Testament."—*Vol. i., p. 48, et seq.*

We would call especial attention to the following passage respecting the antiquity of the Babylonian empire. It certainly has no tendency to strengthen the objections which skeptics have urged against the authority of the Bible from the assumed chronology of the Babylonians:

"The first dynasty of native kings is said to have had eighty-six kings, and to have lasted 34,080 years. This is evidently a fable, for while the kings at first reign upward of 2,000 years, the reigns of the subsequent ones become shorter and shorter, until in the end, they have the duration of an ordinary human life. This dynasty, therefore, being quite fabulous, must be put aside; we must look upon it as analogous to the empire of Nimrod in Genesis." *Vol. i., p. 51.*

The following passage is interesting, as displaying the sagacity of Niebuhr. The prognostications which it contains are now in the process of realization:

"The Greeks, like Calisthenes, expressly attest that the Astronomical observations of the Babylonians were painted on bricks. There are also vases with hieroglyphics and cuneiform inscriptions. A stone with such inscriptions has also been found at Susa; and it is said to have been removed, but what has become of it is unknown, though the English have diligently endeavored to recover it. At present, several monuments of the same kind have been brought to light. When the Zend language shall be discovered, of which there is now great hope, there can be no doubt that the cuneiform writing of Persepolis, will likewise be read, attempts at which have already been made. On the walls of that city there are three kinds of writing, one by the side of the other, and the characters of one of them resemble those on the Babylonian bricks, and the so-called cylinders. When the cuneiform writing of Persepolis shall be discovered, we shall also be able to read the Babylonian inscriptions, and a new and wide field of Asiatic history will be thrown open. *Vol. i., pp. 59, 60.*

Four years after this lecture was delivered, M. Bourouf published in Paris, an account of the Zend language, with its laws and grammatical structure; and principally by the aid thus afforded, Major Rawlinson, an English *savant*, sixteen years after Niebuhr uttered these words, completed his deciphering and translation of the Persian cuneiform inscription at Behistun, which was published in England in 1847-9. This inscription is remarkable, as confirming the history recorded in the book of Esther and other parts of the Bible, and justifying the confidence generally reposed in Herodotus, by its strict agreement with his statements. The progress already made in this disentombing of Asiatic history seems to justify the high expectations which the lec-

turer cherished, and that "in Nineveh, Babylonia, and Persia, centuries long past will come to light again, and the ancient times will present themselves clearly and in all their detail." For a very interesting account of Major Rawlinson's discoveries, we would refer the reader to an able article in the *Westminster Review* for April, 1850.

The view which Niebuhr gives in these Lectures of the ancient Chronologies, and the archaeological details which he develops, all tend to the confirmation of the Mosaic history. It is a circumstance worthy of note, that all those discoveries which at first have seemed to militate against the Bible, have turned out, when more fully understood, in favor of its authenticity. The discoveries of Major Rawlinson, to which we have alluded above, afford some very striking illustrations of its truth. The same thing is true of Mr. Layard's labors at Nineveh. And such we may expect will be the result of all systematic, well-directed inquiries into the past history of the world, as traced on the monuments of by-gone ages, and the equally legible inscriptions which science is detecting and deciphering in every part of the material system. Certain it is that the Bible has nothing to fear either from true history or true science. It is only from fabulous history, and from "science, falsely so called," that its friends have anything to dread. We congratulate our readers on having so valuable a contribution to historical science, as the work before us, brought within their reach. The publishers are entitled to the thanks of the public for the really convenient and substantial form in which they have issued it from the press.

*Ancient Egypt under the Pharaohs.* By JOHN KENRICK, M. A. 2 Vols. New York: Redfield.

Notwithstanding the wonderful impetus which was given to the study of Egyptian history and archaeology just before the beginning of the present century, and the important results which have rewarded the research so industriously prosecuted in this branch of antiquity, no work has heretofore been given to the public embodying the treasures thus collected. Indeed, with the exception of the judicious and valuable work of Sharpe, published several years since, by Moxon, in London, we do not think of a single popular work on Egypt, which pretends to give a satisfactory view of the history, laws, arts, manners and religion of its ancient inhabitants. The great defect of Sharpe's book is, that it fails to embody the results of more recent researches in Egyptian history. A work which should present, in a compendious form, the leading discoveries of modern research into the long buried records of Egyptian life, and glean from ancient historians by the light of freshly deciphered inscriptions, was therefore a desideratum. We are of the opinion, however, that these volumes of Mr. Kenrick will generally be accepted as meeting this want. The author evinces great industry, and a thorough mastery of his subject. He seems to be perfectly familiar with all the literature which bears upon it, both ancient and modern. We will venture to claim for these beautiful volumes, that they will fully meet the popular demand for



light respecting the history and archæology of one of the most interesting nations of antiquity. The style of the author is terse, compact, and clear, and he has given us not only an instructive, but a really interesting work. We propose to recur to it in our pages, at a future day.

We are gratified with the announcement made by Mr. Kenrick in the preface to these volumes, of his intention to follow them with similar works on some of the ancient Asiatic nations. We trust that his enterprising American publisher will be encouraged to give us the results of his labors, in an American dress as tasteful and substantial as that which characterizes the work before us.

*Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley.* With the original Narratives of Marquette, Allouez, Membre, Hennepin and Douay. By J. G. SHEA. New York: Redfield.

We have here a truly valuable collection of information respecting the discovery and early explorations of the Mississippi and the magnificent valley through which it flows. The narratives which are now first collected and presented without abridgment to the American public, are interesting both from their intrinsic character, and from the important locality to which they relate. The impulses which led the early Spanish and French adventurers to thread the course of the mighty river, and to explore its luxuriant valley, were as dissimilar as could well be imagined. Treasure and trade constituted the motive of the De Sotos and the La Salles, while the self-denying missionaries of the Society of Jesus, sought the aggrandizement of their order, the glory of their Church, and the spiritual welfare of the natives. It is interesting to trace these influences which we are accustomed to regard as contributing little to the real prosperity of a country, and see how they have inured to the development of one of the richest and most important sections on the face of the globe. The immediate object of these devoted men has failed; but the great valley has become the center of a population unmatched for enterprise and all the elements of national power, and that mighty flood has become the highway of a commerce already unsurpassed, and which promises to outstrip that of any other thoroughfare in the world. If we consider the present condition and the future prospects of the great Central Valley of the New World, it can not be regarded as a matter of surprise that its earlier history should be a subject of interest, not only to the people of this country, but to all who are concerned in the development of human progress.

The book before us opens with a rapid account of the discovery of the Mississippi, and a notice of the successive explorations of the river and valley. This sketch is, on the whole, quite satisfactory. Then follows an account of the life and labors of Father Marquette. This account is confined chiefly to his labors as a missionary among the Indians. These two articles occupy eighty pages of the present work. Then follow the narratives of the men whose names are given in the title-page.

The narrative of Father Marquette comes first in order, as it was first in point of time. It is full of interest, not so much as the record of stirring

adventures, as of the observations and reflections of the devoted explorer. We regret that our space will not allow us to present our readers copious extracts from his very lucid account of his tour. We must content ourselves, however, with this account of his reception and banquet among the Illinois:

"Having arrived at the great sachem's town, we espied him at his cabin-door, between two old men, all three standing naked, with their calumet turned to the sun. He harangued us in a few words, to congratulate us on our arrival, and then presented us his calumet and made us smoke; at the same time we entered his cabin, where we received all their usual greetings. Seeing all assembled and in silence, I spoke to them by four presents which I made: by the first, I said that we marched in peace to visit the nations on the river to the sea: by the second, I declared to them that God their Creator had pity on them, since, after their having been so long ignorant of him, he wished to become known to all nations; and that I was sent on his behalf with this design; that it was for them to acknowledge and obey him: by the third, that the great chief of the French informed them that he spread peace every where, and had overcome the Iroquois. Lastly, by the fourth, we begged them to give us all the information they had of the sea, and of the nations through which we should have to pass to reach it.

"When I had finished my speech, the sachem rose, and laying his hand on the head of a little slave, whom he was about to give us, spoke thus: 'I thank thee, Blackgown, and thee, Frenchman,' addressing M. Jolliet, 'for taking so much pains to come and visit us; never has the earth been so beautiful, nor the sun so bright, as to-day; never has our river been so calm, nor so free from rocks, which your canoes have removed as they passed; never has our tobacco had so fine a flavor, nor our corn appeared so beautiful as we behold it to-day. Here is my son, that I give thee, that thou mayst know my heart. I pray thee to take pity on me and all my nation. Thou knowest the Great Spirit who has made us all; thou speakest to him and hearest his word: ask him to give me life and health, and come and dwell with us, that we may know him.' Saying this, he placed the little slave near us and made us a second present, an all-mysterious calumet, which they value more than a slave; by this present he showed us his esteem for our governor, after the account we had given of him; by the third, he begged us, on behalf of his whole nation, not to proceed further, on account of the great dangers to which we exposed ourselves.

"I replied, that I did not fear death, and that I esteemed no happiness greater than that of losing my life for the glory of Him who made all. But this these poor people could not understand.

"The council was followed by a great feast which consisted of four courses, which we had to take with all their ways; the first course was a great wooden dish full of sagamity, that is to say, of Indian meal boiled in water and seasoned with grease. The master of ceremonies, with a spoonful of sagamity, presented it three or four times to my mouth, as we would do with a child; he did the same to M. Jolliet. For the second course, he brought in a second dish containing three fish, he took some pains to remove the bones, and having blown upon it to cool it, put it in my mouth, as we would food to a bird; for the third course, they produced a large dog,\* which they had just killed, but learning that we did not eat it, it was withdrawn. Finally, the fourth

---

\* "The dog among all Indian tribes is more valued and more esteemed than by any people of the civilized world. When they are killed for a feast, it is considered a great compliment, and the highest mark of friendship. If an Indian sees fit to sacrifice his faithful companion to give to his friend, it is to remind him of the solemnity of his professions.—F."

course was a piece of wild ox, the fattest portions of which were put into our mouths.

"After this feast we had to visit the whole village, which consists of three hundred cabins. While we marched through the streets, an orator was constantly haranguing, to oblige all to see us without being troublesome; we were every where presented with belts, garters, and other articles made of the hair of the bear and wild cattle, dyed red, yellow, and gray. These are their rarities; but not being of consequence, we did not burthen ourselves with them."

The other accounts are not without interest, especially the one given of the adventures of La Salle; but we have not time to dwell on them.

In view of the laudableness of Mr. Shea's design, and the real value of the service he has rendered to the public, in the collection and translation of these narratives, we ought to be generous perhaps toward him and his performance. But we can not quite approve the arrangement which he has made of his excellent *matériel*, nor are we ready to indorse all that he writes as good English. Whether he is unaccustomed to the use of our language, or whether certain infelicities of style which his work shows are the result of carelessness, we are unable to say. We will merely allude to a few improprieties of expression, which he will do well to correct in a future edition of his book, which we have no doubt will be called for. It is to be hoped, also, he will avoid them in all subsequent attempts at authorship. We do not quite like the expression "studied more narrowly," though a secondary sense of "narrowly" is *closely*. We suppose when he speaks of "the gradual discovery of the Mississippi," he means the gradual *exploration*. Father Marquette in describing the ceremonies connected with the calumet dance, says "d'autre fois il l'approche de la bouche des assistans afin qu'ils fument," which Mr. Shea renders on this wise: "at other times he approaches it to the mouths of the spectators for them to smoke." Marquette's use of "l'approche" was good French, but the use of *to approach* as a transitive verb is very bad English. We have noticed several other very infelicitous renderings of Marquette's French, but we can not particularize. Such sentences as the following are not as infrequent as could be wished: "Father Dalbon seems to have taken *the* more interest in *the* exploring *of* the Mississippi *by* the Wisconsin *as* the projected Illinois mission of Father Marquette was, for a time, at least, defeated."

But these are defects which can readily be pardoned in view of the real value of Mr. Shea's work. It is entitled to a place among well assorted collections on the early settlement and growth of this country. The publisher has done his part in this instance to admiration. We have rarely met with a book "got up" in a more appropriate style.

*Regal Rome.* An Introduction to Roman History. By FRANCIS W. NEWMAN. New York: Redfield, 1852.

Mr. Newman has acquired considerable reputation for genius and scholarship. When it was announced that he intended to issue a work on the history of ancient Rome, everybody concurred in looking for something



astute, able and scholar-like. In these particulars we are not disappointed, though we do not find the work to be exactly what we looked for. We presume others have shared this disappointment with us. Nevertheless we have here a learned, ingenious and highly suggestive treatise on the origin, social life, and public institutions of the ancient Romans. It is properly an attempt to detect the origin and progress of the political life of the Romans, by means of philological and archaeological researches. In his brief preface, Mr. Newman remarks: "In attempting to reconstruct the picture of most ancient Rome, much aid is gained from the singular adherence of the Romans to precedent and form in the development of their constitution. This often enables the modern critic to read the ancient state of things, as the print in a rock shows to a geologist the nature of the leaf which marked it."

The work before us is a development of this idea. It evinces commendable research, and remarkable powers of analysis and combination. It is a book to be *studied*, not merely to be read.

*Stories of Ancient Rome.* By F. W. RICORD. With Illustrations. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1852.

*History of Romulus.* By JACOB ABBOTT. With Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers.

These two works are very similar in appearance and design. The "Stories of Ancient Rome" are professedly based on the works of Livy and Dionysius Halicarnassensis. We have here the stories of Romulus, Numa, Tullus, Aucus, Tarquinus Priscus, Servius, and Tarquinus Superbus, according to the version of the above mentioned authors. These sketches afford a connected account of the ancient Romans, according to their own traditions. The author has made no account of the recent investigations, and undoubted discoveries of Niebuhr, Arnold and others, and his readers are unable to learn from his pages that such men have ever lived. The work is very tastefully got up, and will be attractive to the young, not only on account of the legends which it contains, but likewise on account of its illustrations and elegant exterior. It is to be followed by a second volume, entitled "Stories of the Roman Republic."

Mr. Abbott's "History of Romulus" is a continuation of his valuable historical series. It is characterized by the clear style and interesting manner which have gained so just a reputation for the previous numbers of the series. Mr. Abbott's qualities are so well known that it is needless for us to dwell upon them. No writer in this country is more successful in catering for the mental capacities and tastes of the young. And what is more than can be said of every one who writes for their amusement, we feel a perfect assurance that the moral tendency of every thing he writes is healthful, and that we may safely intrust the minds and hearts of our children to his influence.

*The Israel of the Alps: A History of the Persecutions of the Waldenses.*  
Translated from the French of Dr. Alexis Muston, by WILLIAM HAZLITT.  
Illustrated. London: Ingham, Cooke & Co. New York: Bangs, Brother  
& Co.

Little is known of the origin and earlier history of the remarkable people to whom this work relates. They claim to have been founded by the apostles, and to have derived their principles and institutions directly from them. They are undoubtedly inheritors of the institutions of the primitive church. There is a point where they ceased to follow the church of Rome in its gradual corruptions of the primitive faith and order, though at what time the divergence occurred it is impossible to say. It is highly probable from a survey of their faith and usages, that this separation took place at an early day, but no distinct trace of them is met in history until the ninth century. They were brought prominently into notice by the attempts of the Romish hierarchy to make them conform to the order and usages of that church, which had then reached the lowest depths of its corruption. Our first authentic knowledge of them is through their heroic resistance to the encroachments of that persecuting power, and their noble testimony against its perversions of the truth and institutions of primitive Christianity.

A brief survey of their order, usages and religious views, will serve to show how far they had followed the church of Rome in its departure from apostolic order, and how far they retained the primitive forms and character of the gospel. Their ministers were designated by the title of *Uncle*. They were supported by the voluntary contributions of the people, which went into a general treasury, and were distributed annually by a general synod. Besides their pastors they had a class of ministers known as evangelists or missionaries, whose duty it was to visit the saints scattered through various parts of Italy. These missionaries, according to the primitive usage, always journeyed in pairs, an old and a young man being associated together. At their annual synod the characters of all ministers were examined, and an inquest taken of their conduct during the year. Their preaching, catechizing, and indeed their general system of instruction, in their leading features, corresponded with those of the reformed churches of Europe.

Their doctrines were in general harmony with those of the apostolical church. Dr. Muston gives this compend of them: "The absolute authority and inspiration of the Bible; the Trinity in God; the state of sin in man; free salvation by Jesus Christ; and above all faith working by love." Though they asserted that Christ instituted but two sacraments, they do not appear to have waged any war on the numerous sacraments of the Romish church. They held to auricular confession, but at the same time insisted that confession must first be made to God, from the sincerest depths of the soul. They also held to penance, but they taught that all true penances must spring from horror for sin, and grief for having committed it. They likewise distinguished *venial* from *mortal* sins, but they did not thus minify the nature of sin, but taught that all sin tends to destroy man.

From this brief summary of their faith and practice, it is easy to see the in-

fluence of Romish errors and corruptions upon their religious institutions, but it is also clear that their resistance to innovation commenced before the foundations of faith and a holy life were swept away.

The first systematic persecution waged against the Waldenses was that instigated by the revenge of the Emperor Otho IV., who sought by this means to retaliate upon their prince, Maurice, Count of Savoy, for the support which the latter had given to the claims of his rival, Philip of Suabia. This was in 1209. Since this date their history has been a succession of storms and calms. Now scattered like sheep on the mountains, or butchered in their own valleys; now taking up arms and contending with various fortune against the persecuting power, or reposing in quiet under the shadow of a foreign protection, they have continued to this day, cherishing the faith and maintaining the institutions of their fathers. Those who wish to study the history of their long struggles, their successes and their reverses, will find them detailed with great clearness and power in the beautiful volume before us. Their history, as traced here, presents examples of heroism, of devotion to principle, of fortitude and perseverance under suffering, to which the annals of the world furnish no parallel. Nothing could more clearly and amply vindicate the vitality of their faith, and the permanence of the principles for which they contended. We cordially commend this work, which adds to its other merits that of being really illustrated by several cuts, to the Christian public.

*The Scots Worthies*, Containing A Brief Historical Account of the most Eminent Gentlemen, Ministers and others, who testified or suffered for the cause of Reformation in Scotland, from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the year 1688. By JOHN HOWIE, of Loichgoin. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1853.

We are glad to see this handsome reprint of one of the most popular religious books in Scotland, a book which ranks, in the estimation of pious Presbyterians, with the works of Baxter and Bunyan. It was the production of a simple-hearted, unlettered farmer, who, strong in his love of religion and its martyrs, spent much of his life in collecting memorials of their career, and especially of their sufferings and death. The style is simple and quaint, breathing a pious as well as patriotic enthusiasm. Some of the details may not bear the test of modern historical criticism, but taken as a whole, the work deserves the confidence of the religious public. Howie lived among the wild and romantic scenery hallowed by the heroic deeds, the prayers, the tears and the sufferings of the Scottish Covenanters. Like Old Mortality who renewed their tombs, he felt a profound interest in every thing relating to the martyrs, and regarded it as his mission to give their memories to posterity. He never expected notoriety or literary fame. In fact he scarcely knew whether his book could be published at all. But he satisfied his own pious heart by writing down all he knew and all he could find through inquiry and investigation, respecting their holy lives and heroic deaths. The accounts of Knox, Wishart, Guthrie, Welch, Rutherford and others, who periled their lives in



the high places of the field, in the days of old, possess all the interest of the most thrilling romance. Nay we might say that they possess an interest which romance can not reach. Whatever abatements may be made on the score of literary or historical inaccuracy, all ingenuous persons will acknowledge their beauty and power. We commend the volume to all lovers of antiquity, simplicity, piety and truth.

*Footsteps of our Forefathers: What they suffered and what they sought.* Describing localities and portraying personages and events conspicuous in the struggles for religious liberty. By JAMES G. MIALL. Illustrated. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

The design of this book is to give an account of the early struggles, persecutions and successes of the friends of civil and religious freedom. The author commences with a sketch of Wickliffe, and brings the history of religious struggles down to the days of Doddridge. His sketches of the leading reformers are well drawn, and they are the more interesting from the local memories which the author furnishes. Though he has no remarkable power of dramatizing the scenes he describes, he has invested them with sufficient interest to deserve and command readers. The illustrations aid the design of the author, and make his descriptions of localities more vivid.

*Life of Roger Williams, the earliest Legislator and true champion for a full and absolute liberty of conscience.* By ROMEO ELTON, D. D., F. R. P. S., &c. Providence: George H. Whitney. 1853.

The author of this new life of Roger Williams has attempted to paint the man from life, with all his excellencies and defects, instead of giving a fancy sketch, and investing his features with the *couleur de rose*, which is too apt to be employed in biographical writings. We have read it with great interest. The author is thoroughly familiar with his subject, and seems to have set out with the determination to omit nothing necessary to give the reader a just conception of it. Our estimate of Roger Williams was never higher than it is this day, though Dr. Elton has disclosed certain failings with which we certainly were not before familiar. These failings somehow bring great and good men more within the range of our sympathies. We cease to regard them as living in a higher and more favored region than the mass of humanity, and learn to appreciate their wisdom, and self-denial, and heroism, when we know that they labored under the ordinary infirmities of man. In suggesting the failings of his noble hero, Dr. Elton has merely brought his character and life down to the point where it becomes invested with human interest, thus making his excellencies more prominent, by setting them in the relief of his faults. He still stands out in the appreciative pages of his biographer, as a great man, a true hero, an able supporter, and a firm defender of liberty of conscience and freedom to worship God. The Christian world owes a great debt to Roger Williams. It is time that the men who are reaping the rich fruit of his sufferings and toils, should do full justice to his motives and honor to his memory. This book will contribute somewhat to this end.

*Memoir of Mrs. Sarah Emily York*, formerly Miss S. E. Waldo, Missionary in Greece. By Mrs. R. B. MEDBERRY. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1853.

This is the record of the life of an intelligent, devoted, noble hearted-woman. We have rarely read a work of religious biography with more interest. The author could hardly have had a better subject, but her success is not more owing to this than to her own good sense and nice discrimination. Some may object to the details, and especially to the correspondence connected with what we must, for the want of a better term, designate by the common word courtship, of Mrs. York; but we can pardon this departure from what we suppose would be regarded as strict propriety, in view of the beautiful illustrations which these details afford of her integrity of heart, and her determination to sacrifice her feelings, and her earthly happiness, if need be, to her religious principles. The letters of Mrs. York are every way interesting. This account of her life, which was passed for the most part, out of sight of the great world, can hardly fail to do good. She will be assigned a place among the noble women who have sacrificed the joys of home and the endearments of kindred, for the sake of Christ and the heathen.

*Memoirs of the Lives of Robert and James Alexander Haldane*. By ALEXANDER HALDANE, Esq. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853.

This handsome octavo contains the biographies of two remarkable men. The brothers Haldane have been recognized as among the brightest lights of evangelical religion. Their kinsman has given us in the work before us, a fitting memorial of their piety and labors. It is a work of unusual interest. We propose to recur to it in our pages at a future day.

*Cornelius Nepos*: with notes historical and explanatory. By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers.

We have never been very partial to Cornelius Nepos, as a school classic. The objections to him are too well known to require a statement of them. We are free to say, however, that the excellent scholarship and ripe judgment of Dr. Anthon have enabled him in a great measure to obviate these objections. He has been at great pains to guard the student against the influence of Nepos' errors as to questions of fact, and his not infrequent bad Latin. This is another monument to the industry of this indefatigable editor.

---

(2.) CHURCH HISTORY AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

*Ancient Christianity exemplified* in the private, domestic and social life of the Primitive Christians, and in the original institutions, offices, ordinances and rites of the Church. By LYMAN COLMAN. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1852. 8vo. pp. 645.

This is an enlarged and much improved edition of Dr. Colman's work on "The Antiquities of the Christian Church," published several years since. In its present form it is not only one of the best works on Christian Archæology within the reach of general readers, but as the title-page which we give

above suggests, it presents a very full view of the religious life of the early Christians. In a work of so much general excellence we are sorry to find such evidence of prejudice or want of scholarship in reference to one important branch of Christian Archæology. Section 4, of chapter xix., treats "of unscriptural formalities and doctrines relating to Baptism." The author begins his enumeration on this wise :

"1. *Exclusive immersion.* We can not resist the conviction that this mode of Baptism was the first departure from the teaching and example of the apostles on this subject." p. 367. Now Dr. Colman can not find a first-rate authority on Church History to sustain him in such an assumption. German critics and archæologists from Luther to Neander, are against him. They all assert that immersion was the form used by Christ and his apostles. The highest authorities of the English church teach the same thing. Indeed Dr. Colman only a few pages further on says, "The term Baptism is derived from the Greek βάπτω, from which is formed βαπτίζω, with its derivations βαπτισμός and βάπτισμα, baptism. The primary signification of the original is to dip, plunge, immerse; the obvious import of the noun is *immersion.*" p. 373.

Then again on the subject of Infant Baptism, Dr. Colman is unsustained by the ablest scholars of England and the Continent. But we can not undertake to refute his assertions on these points. With these exceptions he has given us a very reliable and valuable book, which we hope to be able to examine at greater length in some future number of the Review.

*Memorials of the Christian Life in the early and middle ages, including his "Light in Dark Places."* By Dr. AUGUSTUS NEANDER. Translated from the German by J. E. Ryland. London: Henry G. Bohn. 1852. 12mo. pp. 538.

This work is a translation of Neander's "Denkwürdigkeiten," and of his "Light in Dark Places," here very appropriately embodied in one volume. The whole as it stands in this translation is divided into four parts: "1. Christian Life of the first three centuries. 2. Christian Life when Christianity had gained the ascendancy in the Roman Empire. 3. Effects of Christianity during and after the irruption of the Northern Nations into the Roman Empire. 4. Sketches from the History of Missions in the Middle Ages."

We regard this book as one of the most valuable contributions to Church History that Neander has given us. Indeed, all his monographs, such as the "Planting and Training of the Church," "Julian," "Spirit of Tertullian," &c., are invaluable for the light they throw on the opinions, experimental piety and practical life of the early Christians. The influence of Christianity on man's religious susceptibilities, the primitive views of conversion, the principle of the interior Christian life, and kindred topics, are here treated with Neander's usual clearness and skill.

*Discourses on the Christian Body and Form.* By C. A. BARTOL. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1853. 12mo. pp. 376.

This volume is properly the complement of the former volume of discourses issued by Mr. Bartol, on "The Christian Spirit and Life." It is a clear and



elegant statement of the forms and rites of Christianity, and a plea for their perpetuity. In view of the tendency of many of the churches of his order to slight the rites and ordinances of the gospel, we regard this volume as very timely. It evinces a cultivated understanding and a highly refined taste. We thank the author for the performance of a seasonable task, and venture to express the hope that he may reap a large reward for his labor, in the results which his book shall effect.

*A History of the Division of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.* By a Committee of the Synod of New York and New Jersey. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1852.

This is a detailed account of the causes and progress of the division which took place in 1838, in the Presbyterian Church, by a committee of the New School Presbyterians. It is written with great apparent candor, and we see no reason to doubt that, in the main, its statements are reliable. It does not become us, however, to decide the questions at issue between the two branches of our Presbyterian brethren. Those who wish to learn more about this subject will do well to consult this volume, which comes forth under high official sanctions.

---

(3.) BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

*The First Epistle of John practically explained.* By Dr. AUGUSTUS NEANDER. Translated from the German, by Mrs. H. C. CONANT. New York: Lewis Colby. 1852.

We have here the last of the series of Neander's practical expositions of the Epistles. The spirit of John's writings is eminently adapted to the spiritual tendencies of the historian of Christianity. This fact might account for his selection of this epistle as a theme of contemplation. But it is stated that Neander recognized in his time the prevalence of the same errors to correct which John wrote, and that this exposition grew out of a desire to counteract such tendencies. The views inculcated in this work are highly evangelical. The entire truth of the gospel history, the vicarious work of Christ, the necessity of a vital union with him by a living faith, and the importance of his indwelling spirit in order to secure the tempers and habits of the Christian life, are points which he states with great explicitness. This volume will go far to remove the erroneous impressions which many in this country have entertained in reference to his evangelical views. His conception of the scope of the apostle is just, and his method of setting it forth is admirable. The translator has performed an important service to the Christian public in rendering this work into English. It is issued in a very substantial form. The large, clear type on which it is printed is really refreshing to weary eyes.

*Life, character and acts of John the Baptist; and the relation of his ministry to the Christian dispensation.* By the Rev. WILLIAM C. DUNCAN, M. A. New York: Cornish, Lamport & Co. 1853.

This work is professedly based on Van Rohden's Monograph of "Johannes

der Tauffer." That work is embodied in it, and indeed its general scope and design are fully preserved. It has been the aim of Professor Duncan to supply such additional material as seemed necessary to meet the inquiries which are suggested by the Baptist's life and mission. His book may be regarded in its present form as a new, if not an independent work. It evinces thorough scholarship, good taste and sound judgment. It is a valuable contribution to our Biblical literature.

*The Inspiration of the Scriptures and other treatises.* By ALEXANDER CARSON, LL. D. New York: Edward H. Fletcher.

The treatise of Dr. Carson on inspiration occupies about half of the volume before us. It is intended to be an answer to the views of Rev. Daniel Wilson, Dr. John Pye Smith, and Rev. Dr. Dick. The question of Inspiration is the great question of the present time. We wish we could say that this treatise of Dr. Carson meets it, or that it affords any essential aid to its elucidation. Our conviction, however, is otherwise. Dr. Carson was a great man, a man of vast learning, but his qualifications to write on such a subject were by no means remarkable. The other treatises in the volume, are many of them practical, and adapted to do good.

*The Bible in the Family; or Hints on Domestic Happiness.* By H. A. BOARDMAN, D. D. Fifth edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1852. 16mo. pp. 328.

This volume is a plea for family religion. It is timely and able. The fact that it has reached a fifth edition shows that it is appreciated.

*Letters to a Millenarian.* By Rev. A. WILLIAMSON, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, N. J. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1852. 18mo. pp. 179.

These letters are written to show that the present Jews are not the covenant people of God, or "lawful heirs of the Abrahamic will." The author evinces very respectable dialectic skill. He makes out a strong case. Our readers will be interested in the discussion.

---

(4.) PHILOSOPHY.

*Outlines of Moral Science.* By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, D. D., late Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. New York: Charles Scribner. 1852.

The title of this work from the pen of the late lamented Professor of Theology at Princeton, consisting of 272 pages, 16mo., is nearly the same as Dr. Wayland's *Elements of Moral Science*, and had its origin in precisely the same way; for both of these gentlemen in their college instructions, being dissatisfied with Paley's able but dangerous work as a class book, endeavored to supply its place by a system of their own. Fundamentally they teach nearly the same views, and arrive at much the same results. They are evidently both greatly indebted to the profound and original views of Bishop Butler, a fact frankly acknowledged by Dr. Wayland. Both productions

are eminently distinguished for clearness, simplicity and orderly method. The work of Dr. Alexander is occupied strictly with the principles or laws of moral science; Dr. Wayland extends his researches to the various duties which rest upon these as their foundation. In some particulars, perhaps, the views of Dr. Alexander are applied to a wider range of topics, than those of Dr. Wayland, and in our view are more rigidly and elegantly enforced. The latter indulges in greater vivacity and variety of illustration. Preceding Dr. Alexander's work by several years, the palm of originality must be given to Dr. Wayland; though we think, in some particulars, the work of Dr. Alexander the most full and satisfactory. The latter is distinguished for its extreme simplicity, combined with great force and subtilty of argument. In some particulars, we might take exceptions to his method, which, though founded upon great intuitive convictions, and recognizing the supremacy of absolute and eternal law, professes to rely upon a simply inductive process. His chapters upon the relations of religion to moral science, are less satisfactory than those of Dr. Wayland, upon the same subject. We think Dr. Alexander quite successful in showing that the moral quality of actions resides not simply in the intention, but in the character or disposition of the individual. Some of his distinctions upon this subject are exceedingly delicate and beautiful. His views of liberty and necessity, as related to the will, are generally just. One or two points, perhaps, are pressed too far.

Upon the whole, we regard this as a valuable contribution to moral science; though we yet hope to see a more complete and fundamental discussion of the whole subject than any we yet possess. For ordinary academic purposes, the work of Dr. Wayland is every way admirable; but we should like to see the same mind grapple successfully with some of the great moral and philosophical problems which are scarcely touched in his "*Elements*." Moral science we regard as yet in its infancy. In its ultimate analysis, it must rest upon the absolute nature of things. It comprehends our most interior relations to God, to one another, and the universe. It thus involves the discussion of some of the profoundest questions in the sphere of spiritual philosophy. We want a Bacon to plow up the whole domain, and lay it open to the inspection of the world.

*A Manual of the History of Philosophy.* Translated from the German of Tennemann, by Rev. A. JOHNSON, M. A. Revised, enlarged and continued, by J. R. Morell. London: H. G. Bohn. 1852.

The value of Tennemann's Manual is well known. It is brief, indeed, and in parts quite unsatisfactory, but it is full of information, especially in relation to books and authorities on the subjects of which it treats. Its value is considerably enhanced by the additions contained in this new edition, which forms one of Bohn's Philological Library. The editor, J. R. Morell, cousin-german of J. D. Morell, the well known author of "*The History of Speculative Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century*," has performed his task with considerable care and ability. He is evidently familiar with the history of modern philosophy, and though superficial enough at times, as his notices of



philosophy in this country testify, has, on the whole, well occupied his space. He leans, we fear, to the extravagances of the transcendental school, and has too much sympathy with Fourierism and animal magnetism. He has translated one of the works of Fourier, and speaks with enthusiasm of the originality and splendor of Fourier's philosophical speculations.

*On the Adaptation of External Nature to the Physical Condition of Man.* By JOHN KIDD, M. D., F.R. S. London: H. G. Bohn. 1852. 12mo. 332.

This number of "Bohn's Scientific Library" is one of the celebrated Bridgewater Treatises, which originated in a trust bequeathed to the President of the Royal Society, by the Earl of Bridgewater, in 1829. There were eight of these Treatises. The present volume is the second in the series, as originally published. All intelligent men understand its merits.

#### (5.) GENERAL LITERATURE.

*Select British Eloquence*: embracing the best speeches entire of the most eminent orators of Great Britain for the last two centuries; with sketches of their lives, an estimate of their genius, and notes, critical and explanatory. By CHAUNCEY A. GOODRICH, D. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1822. 8vo. pp. 947.

This is a long title-page, but it is scarcely long enough to describe the merits of the book. We have here the memoirs of such men as Earl Digby, Robert Walpole, Chesterfield, Chatham, Mansfield, Burke, Fox, Brougham, and others, with some of the best speeches of each, accompanied in every instance with an account of the circumstances which called them forth. In fact this volume comprises the Parliamentary History of Great Britain for the last two hundred years. The compiler has performed a signal service to students and professional men in the preparation of this work. We are sure we but express the general desire when we venture to urge Professor Goodrich to do for American publicists and orators what he has so admirably done for those of Great Britain.

#### ART. IX.—LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

1. GERMANY.—*Baumgarten* is writing a work entitled "Die Apostelgeschichte," &c., in which he traces the course of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome. The present volume extends to chapter 12.

*Delitzsch* is engaged in completing *Drichsler's* "Commentary on Isaiah," only two parts of which were issued before he died.

Professor *Phillippi's* "Commentary on Romans" is completed. The third part containing chapters 12-16 has just been issued.

*Keerl* has published his "Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, a Testimony against the Apocrypha of the Old Testament on the ground of the Word of God."

*C. Heyet* has executed a new translation of the "New Testament from the Greek."

*D. A. Tholuck* has written a work entitled "The Spirit of the Lutheran Theologians at Wittenberg, during the seventeenth century."

Professor *J. A. B. Lutherbeck* has issued a work entitled "The New Testament System, or the age of Religious Conversion."

*Lechler* has a book on "The Apostolical and Post-Apostolical Age."

*H. B. Fassel* has published "The Mosaic and Rabbinical Civil Law, treated after the manner of modern Law Books."

*Kohlbrügge* has issued a book entitled "Discourses on the First Epistle of Peter."

*Lücke* has published a second edition of his "Introduction to the Revelation of John."

*J. F. Hamer-Purgstall* has written a work in 4 vols. 4to, on "The History of Arabian Literature."

A new work on "The Pneumatology of the Moslems" has appeared from the pen of *Dr. J. Hamer-Purgstall*.

*C. R. Lepsius*, the Antiquary, has published his work on "The Monuments of Egypt and Ethiopia."

"A History of German Protestantism," by *Dr. H. Heppel*, in 1 vol. 8 vo. has been recently published.

ENGLAND.—*Mr. Murray* announces "St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians," edited with notes, by *Rev. A. P. Stanley*; also "St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians and Galatians," edited with notes, by *Rev. B. Jowett*. "Fresh Discoveries at Nineveh, and Researches at Babylon," by *A. H. Layard*. "History of Ancient Pottery," by *Samuel Birch*, of the British Museum. "Journal of a Cruise among the Islands of the Western Pacific, including those inhabited by the Polynesian Negro race," by *Capt. John Erskine*; also a "History of the Christian Church," by *Rev. J. C. Robertson*.

*Mr. Nisbet* announces a work by *Dr. Angus*, on "Christian Life, its origin, law and end; or the life of Christ adapted to missionary purposes."

*Mr. Blackader* announces a new work under the title of "The Chronological Bible."

*Bentley* is about to publish *De Sauley's* "Narrative of a Journey in Syria and round the Dead Sea," translated by *Count Edward De Warren*.

The *Longmans* announce "The Life and Correspondence of *Thomas Moore*," edited by *Lord John Russell*, in two volumes. They have just published "*Hippolytus and his Age*," by the *Chevalier Bunsen*.

*Mr. Thomas Carlyle* is said to be engaged in writing a "Life of *Frederic the Great*."

[We regret that many of our book notices, and the great bulk of our literary intelligence are crowded out.]

## ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

### DEATHS.

<i>Jonathan R. Green</i> , Manchester, Ver., September 19.	<i>Silas Kingsley</i> , Chester, Mass., Oct. 19. <i>Jos. Wilson</i> , Waldoboro', Me., Nov. 6.
---	---

### ORDINATIONS.

<i>R. K. Ashley</i> , N. Bridgewater, Mass., Sept. 29.	<i>Joseph R. Ash</i> , Philadelphia, Nov. 8. <i>Ja's De Bois</i> , Black Rock, N. Y., Nov. 9.
<i>Welcome Lewis</i> , Mansfield, Mass., Sept. 30.	<i>J. A. Goodhue</i> , Norwich, Ct., Nov. 9. <i>John P. Hunting</i> , Parsonsfield, Me., Nov. 12.
<i>S. T. Livermore</i> , Livonia, N. Y. Oct. 28.	<i>Foster Henry</i> , Tyringham, Mass., Nov. 23.
<i>E. Gale</i> , Johnson, Ver. Nov. 3.	<i>Emmons P. Bond</i> , New Britain, Conn., Dec. 2.
<i>Amos W. Boardman</i> , Passumpsic, Vt., Nov. 5.	
<i>Heman Jones</i> , Smyrna Village, Nov. 7.	

### CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

<i>West Union</i> , Fayette County, Iowa.	<i>Churchville</i> , New York, Nov. 4.
<i>Bear Creek</i> , Iowa, Sept. 28.	<i>Upland</i> , Pennsylvania, Nov. 11.
<i>Hornersville</i> , New York, Oct. 24.	

### HOUSES DEDICATED.

<i>North Lansing</i> , New York, Sept. 11.	<i>Middleborough</i> , Mass., Nov. 3.
<i>Willington</i> , New Jersey, Sept. 29.	<i>Hoboken</i> , New Jersey, Nov. 4.
<i>Hudson</i> , Michigan, Oct. 8.	<i>East Dedham</i> , Mass., Nov. 18.
<i>Marshall</i> , Michigan, Oct. 14.	<i>Lee</i> , Mass., Nov. 23.
<i>Leesville</i> , New York, Oct. 23.	